NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCCXCVII.

APRIL, 1898.

IRELAND SINCE '98.

BY JOHN E. REDMOND, M. P.

THE history of Ireland since the insurrection of 1798—the centenary of which will be celebrated this year not only in Ireland itself, but in every land in which Irishmen or the descendants of Irishmen live—is not the least interesting portion of a story which, though not presenting such great imperial issues as make up the record of Greece, Rome, France, England, and other countries, is yet full of dramatic situations and of serious lessons for statesmen. I regret to be obliged to add that it is not the least sad. I propose to sketch that history in broad outline in the following pages.

The immediate result of the insurrection, as it had been the undoubted object of its real authors, was the Union of 1800. A good deal of controversy has hung round this ill-starred Union, the motives of those who promoted it, the means by which it was carried, and the results by which it has been attended. On none of those points is there practically any controversy now. Charles Kendal Bushe, afterwards Chief Justice of Ireland, declared that the Union was "the denial of the rights of nature to a great nation from an intolerance of her prosperity." Ireland, according to the confession of Lord Chancellor Clare, himself one of the prime promoters of the Union, had, under the free constitution

Copyright, 1898, by THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW PUBLISHING COMPANY. All rights reserved.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of 1782, progressed more rapidly in every element of prosperity than any other country in Europe during the same period. England had always been jealous of every advance made by Ireland on the path of social or political progress, and had shown her jealousy by laws which denied the people of Ireland all the ordinary means of self-advancement and extinguished one after another all their industries which could in any way compete with her own. No doubt she also remembered the fact that Ireland was a distinct nation from herself and, as such, had hopes, expectations, and desires of her own; that she had shown herself inclined to hearken to the doctrines of Swift and Molyneux who taught her that, by natural right and even by constitutional law, she *ought to be as free as England itself*; that she had actually taken advantage of England's weakness in 1782 to wrest from her in that year, by the arms of the Volunteers, her legislative independence; and doubtless, also, England was afraid of the possible developments of Irish policy under the guidance of a free Parliament, although, as a matter of fact, Ireland had not used the freedom it won in 1782 to the disadvantage of England, but the contrary.

For all those reasons, the policy of the Union was resolved on, and it was determined to carry it through, whatever the means that might be necessary. The conversion of a perfectly constitutional agitation for reform of the Irish constitution into a so-called rebellion was the initial step. Into the history of that cold-blooded performance it is not within my purpose to enter here. The second step was to bribe the Irish Parliament to commit suicide, it having been found that even the terrors of '98 were not sufficient of themselves to bring about that consummation. That the Union was accomplished by the most open, base, and profligate corruption that has ever stained the annals of any country, is now an admitted fact. The Peerage, the Episcopal Bench, the Bench of Justice, the Civil Service, the Army and the Navy were all commodities trafficked in for the purchase of votes for the Union. "The caitiffs of corruption," as Grattan said, "were everywhere—in the lobby, in the street, on the steps and at the doors of every Parliamentary leader; offering titles to some, offices to others, corruption to all." "The basest corruption and artifice," said Lord Chief Justice Bushe, "were exerted to promote the Union; all the worst pas-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sions of the human heart entered into the service; and all the most depraved ingenuity of the human intellect was tortured to devise new contrivances of fraud." It is only a wonder, under these circumstances, that the project of the Union was defeated in the first session of the Irish Parliament in which it was brought forward. It was carried in the second, and with that event commenced the epoch with which I am now about to deal.

The political results of the Union claim attention in the first place. What the hopes or expectations of English ministers were it is difficult, even after all that has been made known to us during the last ninety-eight years, to say. They probably believed that, by the combined effect of intimidation, cajolery, and false promises, Ireland would eventually become a willing serf, or a willing partner in the firm of "the United Kingdom." No similar difficulty is experienced in arriving at the thoughts and feelings aroused in the minds of the great majority of Irishmen themselves by the accomplishment of the Union. "I tell you," said Plunket, afterward a peer and Lord Chancellor of Ireland, addressing the Irish House of Commons, "if, circumstanced as you are, you pass this Act, it will be a nullity, and that no man in Ireland will be bound to obey it." "You may," said Saurin, afterward Attorney-General for Ireland, "make the Union binding as a law, but you cannot make it obligatory on conscience. It will be obeyed as long as England is strong, but resistance to it will be in the abstract a duty, and the exhibition of that resistance will be a mere question of prudence." Plunket and Saurin themselves, as well as others, who, with them, thundered against the Union when it was proposed, afterward took service under England, and the Protestant minority in Ireland to which they belonged became, with but few exceptions, advocates of the new state of things. But the bulk of the nation imbibed the doctrines of Plunket and Saurin, and have acted upon them to this day. From the very moment of the accomplishment of the Union down to the moment I write, Ireland, broadly speaking, has been either actively or passively in revolt against the usurpation of 1800, and England has been at the same time engaged in a constant effort to buy off its opposition by periodical concessions or to put it down by force or fraud.

The abortive effort of Emmet may have been, to some extent, a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

continuation of the '98 movement; but, even if we take that view of Emmet's gallant attempt to break the bonds of his country's servitude, what followed showed that the Union had not killed Irish aspirations for liberty. The nation was stunned, indeed, by the events of 1798 and 1800, and lay, for a time, quiescent; and the hope was indulged in England that the long struggle of centuries was at last over. But appearances were delusive, and the hope was vain. The struggles for Catholic Emancipation and Repeal of the Union came in due time to show that Irish national spirit was not yet dead. They were both, no doubt, mainly the work of a single man; but even the genius of O'Connell would have failed to rouse Ireland as he did on both questions, if he had sown the seed on unfruitful soil. As it was, he marshalled the nation in an array, the mere sight of which actually won part of the battle, and, if he himself had been then a younger man, he might have won outright. The O'Connell era may be said to have extended from the defeat of Emmet and Lord Edward Fitzgerald to the Liberator's death in 1847. It was followed almost immediately by the attempted insurrection of '48. That effort also was in one sense a failure, and once more Ireland relapsed into a state of political torpor which may be said to have continued for nearly twenty years. In the interval she yielded herself up, apparently without a struggle, to a gang of political prostitutes who sold their country to one or other English party for personal profit, and allowed every national interest to be sacrificed to English party needs. Again pæans of joy were raised in England and by England's agents in Ireland over the laying of the ghost of the Irish difficulty. Lord Carlisle, Lord Lieutenant of Ireland so lately as the early sixties, went from dinner to dinner, from the Castle in Dublin to the Mansion House, from the Mansion House to various Irish cities, proclaiming the glad news that Ireland was prospering, and that at last all was peace after centuries of struggle. But again prediction was falsified by the event. At the very moment that Lord Carlisle was speaking his pleasant and confident prophecies, a vast and formidable conspiracy had mined the ground under his feet. It has been customary with Englishmen to sneer at the Fenians and the Fenian movement; but there were periods when the Fenians were not only not sneered at, but absolutely dreaded, and it took years

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and all the arts of intimidation and legal chicanery to suppress them. If they did nothing else, they proved, at least, that the national spirit was not dead, and they sowed the seed of future struggles against foreign domination. Again failure was followed by torpor, and again it was hoped that Ireland would henceforth cease to trouble. How vain this fond hope was, Charles Stewart Parnell showed in his turn. Although the disproportion between the resources of Ireland and England had immensely increased since the days of O'Connell, the latest and in some senses the greatest of Irish leaders not only called out into active life the immortal spirit of Irish nationality which was so often supposed to have been killed, but extorted concessions from England of the highest practical value and led the nation to the very threshold of freedom. Since Parnell's death torpor has once more supervened; but it is only torpor, not death. Deep down in the very heart of the nation the Union is still, after nearly a hundred years, regarded as a usurpation. In the words of Saurin, resistance to it is still in the abstract a duty, and the exhibition of that resistance is a mere question of prudence.

The Union was proposed and advocated professedly as much in the interest of Ireland as of England. The Catholics were promised Catholic Emancipation, and some of them, including even some dignitaries of the church, were deceived by that promise. The country was promised prosperity—greater prosperity, indeed, than it had achieved under the free constitution of 1782. The era of social strife was to be closed. The law was to be administered in a spirit of impartial justice. How were those pledges and promises redeemed?

Take the last point first. Scarcely had the Union been accomplished when the very fountains of justice were polluted by the appointment to the judicial bench and to every legal office of ferocious partisans of the Orange ascendency. No Catholic obtained or could hope for fair play at the hands of those agents of English law. If by chance, as happened on one or two occasions, an honest man obtained a seat on the bench and happened to give expression to his indignation at the travesty of law which he witnessed on all sides, a dead set was made upon him and he was hunted from his place. In the first ten or fifteen years of the century, two judges of the Superior Court—

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Justices Fox and Johnson—suffered this fate for merely rebuking high-placed aristocrats for gross acts of partisanship and illegality. As the law proved insufficient even in the hands of such partisans for their vile purposes, it was continually strengthened by the passing of Coercion Acts. Down to the enactment of the perpetual Coercion Act of 1887 it has been estimated that there was nearly one such Act for every year of the century. Some of them provided for the wholesale disarmament of the people; some of them for the establishment of tribunals resembling Courts Martial; some of them for the suspension of Habeas Corpus and imprisonment by *lettres de cachet;* some for the more easy packing of juries, and two at least, including the last, for abolishing trial by jury altogether in certain cases; some for legalizing domiciliary visits, and some creating new crimes not heard of before in English jurisprudence. Law, in short, came to the Irish people not only "clothed in a foreign garb," but displaying the hateful features of partiality and corruption. The consequences were inevitable. Executions often became in the eyes of the people judicial murders; it was thought no crime to violate the law when there were wrongs to be redressed or rights to be vindicated; and justice as administered in England's name was a by-word.

The history of the struggle for religious equality is specially disgraceful to England. The authors of the Union who promised Catholic Emancipation as the result of the Union deliberately broke their words. They not merely neglected to effect emancipation, but they actively opposed it. Nor did their successors change their tactics till the very last when the fear of civil war, as the Duke of Wellington himself admitted, compelled them to do so. Even then the "concession" was incomplete. The Emancipation Act of 1829 has been talked of as a great measure, and, of course, it was; but, read in the light of the closing days of the century, it really looks as much like a measure of pains and penalties for Catholics as like a measure of freedom. Quite a number of its clauses or sections expressly impose disabilities for certain professors of the Catholic faith. The religious orders, for instance, are banned by it, and up to a few years ago no Catholic lawyer in Ireland, no matter how competent or how distinguished, could occupy the highest post in his profession—namely, the Lord

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Chancellorship. When at last partial emancipation was granted it was accompanied by a sweeping measure of disfranchisement. Catholics were rendered capable of election to Parliament; but in order that as few as possible of them might be able to get there the forty-shilling freehold vote, which carried O'Connell's election for Clare, was absolutely swept away, and not again till fourteen years ago were the bulk of the householders of Ireland, in town or country, admitted to the franchise, though the English established household suffrage for their own boroughs in 1868. The Catholics in Ireland, it need hardly be said, have all through the century been three to one of the entire population; but it took seventy years after the passing of the Union to put all the denominations on a level by disestablishing the Church of the minority. In the affair of education the story of English policy is of a piece with the policy of England toward Ireland in everything else. Forbidden to learn at all in the seventeenth century, Irish Catholics were offered, for more than thirty years after the Union, the alternative of still going without education altogether or obtaining it in institutions which their consciences prevented them from attending, and this is actually the alternative still presented to such of them as desire the higher education imparted in universities. Finally, though religious equality in the abstract now prevails in Ireland, in the concrete it is largely a myth; for even still an undue proportion—it may be said a large majority—of all the posts of power, emolument, or honor in the country are held by professors of other faiths than that of the great majority of the people.

Has social peace been restored to Ireland since or in consequence of the Union? Let the history of the Irish land question be the answer. It may not be generally known, but it is nevertheless a fact, that the land laws of Ireland which were enacted by the Irish Parliament were actually in some respects, though made by landlords, more favorable to the tenants than some of the enactments passed for Ireland by the Imperial Parliament after the Union. They made, for example, eviction a more roundabout process and to some extent recognized local rights. But under the fostering aegis of Imperial rule the land code gradually became altered for the worse, till in 1860, under the guise, forsooth, of a measure of relief, an Act was passed which,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by abolishing all rights derived from custom and tenure and placing the relations of landlord and tenant entirely on the basis of contract, opened the way for the wholesale robbery and extermination of the tenants. To substitute for equitable rights those derived from contract in any country where freedom of contract does not exist, is manifestly a farce so far as the change is alleged to be intended for the benefit of both the parties concerned. In Ireland, owing to the fact that the tenant, generally speaking, had no alternative but to accept the landlord's terms, whatever they might be, such a change amounted practically to a decree against his welfare, and, in some cases, against even his very existence. It worked, in almost every case, a confiscation of his property in his holding, for it enabled him to be rented on his own improvements. The landlord, of course, took advantage of his new powers and in many cases exercised them to the full. He raised his rent with every improvement made by his tenant and ruthlessly evicted the tenant if he did not pay. To make matters worse, the way was laid open two years before for the entry on the scene of a new class of landlords worse than any of the members of the old.

This result was attained by the Incumbered Estates Act of 1858, under which insolvent estates were peremptorily sold to the highest bidder to satisfy incumbrancers. This act also, forsooth, was proposed as a benefit to Ireland? How did it work out in practice? Speculators, oftentimes without capital of their own, came in and bought estates with money secured by mortgage of the lands. No sooner were they installed as owners than they proceeded to double or treble the rents. If they were not paid they evicted wholesale, turned the vacant holdings into big grass farms, and let them to big graziers. Cattle and sheep were calculated to give less trouble than men and women, and, moreover, they had no votes. The consequences were inevitable. The oppressed peasantry, finding no protection in the law, took the law into their own hands. In many cases they murdered their oppressors and the agents of their oppressors. A social war arose instead of the blessed peace promised by the authors of the Union. Outrages were met by brutal coercion. Coercion in turn bred further crime, and crime was followed in due course by still more severe and relentless coercion. For years and years things went in that vicious circle. Appeal after appeal was

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

made in Parliament for legislative relief for the tenantry, but in vain. Even such moderate demands as that for compensation for a tenant's improvements on eviction were rejected and denounced as projects of confiscation by the just and beneficent Parliament of the United Kingdom. Nor was it till 1870 that the first real step was taken to remedy a state of things which would have done discredit even to Turkey, and it was not till Parnell arose that the axe was laid to the root of the upas-tree of exterminating landlordism. Even yet, however, the work of justice in this matter remains to be completed, for it is even still possible to confiscate a tenant's improvements in part, though he is no longer subject to capricious eviction.

It may be easily imagined that under those circumstances prosperity did not come upon Ireland under the Union of 1800. For how could Ireland become prosperous when agriculture was its main industry and when the agriculturists of the country fared for more than seventy years of the Union in the manner I have described? But there were other causes than those mentioned for the commercial and industrial stagnation which prevails even to the present hour in unfortunate Ireland, and I now proceed to direct attention to one which has of late assumed and promises to continue to assume a more than usual importance in the eyes of the Irish people of all classes. I mean the fearful drain on the resources of the country caused by over-taxation for Imperial purposes.

The Seventh Article of the Act of Union is that which regulates the financial relations of the two countries of Great Britain and Ireland. It is an elaborate provision and was, of course, recommended to the Irish Parliament by its English authors as the very essence of fairness. It was rendered necessary by the disproportion at the time of the Union between the British and Irish debts. The former amounted to 422 millions of pounds sterling; the latter to only 24 millions. It is not necessary here to enter into the causes that raised the Irish debt to that figure; but it may be mentioned briefly that not long before 1800 Ireland was practically free from a national debt and that the burden was brought into existence solely through English policy. England practically compelled Ireland to contribute beyond her means to her iniquitous foreign wars, and the very millions that were employed in fomenting and repressing the insurrection of '98 and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in corrupting the Irish Parliament to pass the Union were also extracted from Ireland herself by the same agency. More than twenty millions were in this way added in a few years to the debt of Ireland. All of this addition to the Irish national burden was, therefore, rightly England's liability; but, of course, the outrage on Ireland was committed and could not be undone, and so at the Union the two debts stood to each other as I have stated. In consequence, it was proposed and enacted that Ireland should henceforth contribute to the common expenses of the United Kingdom in the proportion of 1 to 7½—that being the proportion which her relative ability to bear taxation showed, according to the promoters of the Union, to be the just one. It was at once pointed out by the chief opponents of the Union measure—Grattan, Foster, and others—that the relative taxable capacity of Ireland was put at too high a figure, and the contention was made good by indisputable facts and figures.

The arrangement, however, was carried, with additional proposals to the effect that, whenever the debts of the two countries should reach a certain defined proportion to each other, and when the circumstances of the two countries became similar, the two exchequers should be amalgamated. It was also agreed that further debt incurred after the Union should be regarded as joint debt. Observe now what happened. England continued to wage war on the Continent of Europe, and fresh borrowing was necessitated. The very first thing that was done was to violate the provision making that further liability joint liability. A certain proportion of it was charged to the separate account of Ireland. The result was that in sixteen years the debt of Ireland was raised to 113 millions. This sum brought the debt of Ireland to the proportion required for the amalgamation of the two debts and the two exchequers, and as Ireland was unable to bear the annual charge for it—her ability to bear taxation having, as was predicted in 1800, been over-rated—the amalgamation took place, although the circumstances of the two countries had not become similar, but on the contrary had become more dissimilar than ever. The best of it is that this transaction was represented at the time and has been represented since as a piece of beneficence to Ireland. Ireland was first deliberately made bankrupt; in return for England's undertaking to become responsible for her 113 millions, Ireland was then made

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

responsible for England's 700 millions; and finally, she was henceforth to be taxed on the high British level. Such beneficence would in any other country be called robbery.

The system of equal taxation in the two countries was not, indeed, carried out in its entirety at once. The policy of exempting Ireland from some taxes imposed in England and of taxing one or two of her products on a lower scale than that insisted on in England in the case of similar products, was not adopted for a few years; but at last—in 1852-3—Mr. Gladstone, as Chancellor of the Exchequer, took the final plunge by proposing an equalization of all taxes throughout the whole extent of Great Britain and Ireland. He did more. Four millions had been advanced at the time of the Great Famine of 1847 to relieve the distress in Ireland and charged on the ratepayers of Ireland. It ought to have been an Imperial charge; but it was not made so; and, in 1852-3, Mr. Gladstone wiped out the charge and, as a set-off, extended the Income Tax to Ireland, which has since yielded nearly thirty millions sterling! The result of this fresh act of "beneficence to Ireland" was soon apparent. While the taxation of Great Britain was raised by Mr. Gladstone's proposals 18 per cent., Ireland's was raised 52 per cent.! The further result, as ascertained by a recent Royal Commission, is that Ireland since that date has been and is now overtaxed, her taxable capacity compared with that of England being taken into account, to the extent of nearly three millions of pounds sterling a year.

Imagine the effect of such a drain on a small and poor country like Ireland. But this over-taxation was not the only device of England for crushing the commercial and industrial prosperity of Ireland. To pass over minor matters, such as the special aid given for many years to the Scotch fisheries—aid similar to which was afterward expressly denied to the Irish fisheries—I come to the Repeal of the Corn Laws. This was a great and beneficent measure, so far as concerned Great Britain, which was largely a manufacturing country and depended for its food on supplies from abroad. It had a totally different effect on Ireland, which was mainly an agricultural country, which produced its own food supply, and which depended for its prosperity mainly on a good market in England and elsewhere for its agricultural products. The artisans of England benefited immensely, accordingly, by the Repeal of the Corn Laws; the farmers

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of Ireland were eventually ruined by it, and, with them, all who depended upon them, the landlords of Ireland included. Meanwhile, the rich manufacturers of England entered into competition with the impoverished manufacturers of Ireland. The result was inevitable. The Irish manufacturers unable to protect themselves went under in the struggle with the overwhelming capital of their English competitors. By degrees the manufacturers of Ireland disappeared except from two or three centres, and the population at the same time kept dwindling. In the last fifty years it has decreased from over eight millions to about four and a half. It now numbers less than it did in '98, while that of England has increased from ten millions to considerably over thirty millions. If I add to this record of disaster the ravages of the Great Famine of 1846-7—the result of English policy, and not of the failure of the potato crop—I shall not have exhausted the catalogue of Irish sufferings, but I shall have made it at least sufficiently full for my present purpose.

This is, in broad outline, the history of Ireland since 1798. The Union, the accomplishment of which was the main object of the men who fomented, nurtured, matured, and eventually brought about the Insurrection of that year and then repressed it in a sea of blood and with every circumstance of cruelty and brutality, has been to Ireland an unmixed curse and even to England itself a source of constant trouble and dishonor.

Of course, the advocates of the maintenance of the Union have something to say for themselves, and it may be well to notice their plea here very briefly. They cannot and do not deny that all through the century Ireland has been practically in revolt against the Union. They cannot and do not deny that, in consequence, England has all through the century governed Ireland as if it were an unwilling slave chafing at and trying to burst his chains. They cannot and do not deny that every reform passed for Ireland during that period has been wrung from the Imperial Parliament by agitation and disturbance in Ireland. They cannot deny that the Union has produced a war of classes instead of social peace, and that religious antagonism has often been actually more acute since the Union than it was in the days of Grattan's Parliament. They cannot and do not deny the fearful reduction of the population of Ireland —a reduction unparalleled in any civilized or progressive country

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on the face of the earth, and that nevertheless there have been one appalling famine, recurring periods of distress, and a chronic state of poverty all along the Western seaboard of the island. They do not deny that the manufacturers of Ireland have dwindled almost out of existence and that the main industry of agriculture is always in a more or less depressed condition.

But they say that, in spite of all those things, Ireland has yet on the whole prospered in the last hundred years. The deposits in the Irish banks have greatly increased. The tonnage of the principal Irish ports has also increased. The people are better housed, better fed, better clothed, and better educated than the Irish people were in 1798. Granted all this for the sake of argument, and yet what does it prove? That Ireland has progressed as it ought to have done—has progressed like England, Belgium, France, Norway, or any other European country? Of course not, but that it has shared to some slight extent, despite the most adverse conditions, in the general progress of the world. No one denies that Ireland has advanced in some respects since 1798; what is complained of is that she has not been allowed to advance as she would have done and was actually doing under her own free constitution between 1782 and 1796, and that nothing but the backwash, as it were, of the universal prosperity of the world outside has been allowed to touch her shores. The advocates of the Union might have made their case apparently stronger by pointing out that Ireland has now several things she did not possess in 1798—railways, and telegraphs, and the penny postage, and the telephone—but the fallacy of the argument would have been there all the same.

Ireland, however, is making way politically, at least—slowly, but surely. The blood of the martyrs of '98 was not shed in vain. The efforts and sacrifices of the men of '48, '65, and '67 have borne fruit. The statesmanship of Parnell not only achieved much, but will yet inspire the whole Irish nation to brave and wise deeds for its liberation. Even as I write, the very supporters of the Union are actually offering a wide measure of local self-government. There is no reason for despair.

"Truth forever on the scaffold, wrong forever on the throne;
Yet that scaffold sways the future, and behind the dim unknown
Standeth God within the shadow, keeping watch above His own."

J. E. REDMOND.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

STATE REGULATION OF RAILWAYS.

BY HARRY PERRY ROBINSON, EDITOR OF THE *RAILWAY AGE.*

THE decision of the United States Supreme Court in what is known as the Nebraska Maximum Rate case, which was rendered on March 7, 1898, promises to be of the greatest value to the railways of the country, especially in the Western and Southern States.

If the founders of the Republic could have foreseen the extraordinary development of our railway system, they would undoubtedly never have permitted the present anomalous conditions to arise—conditions wherein there is constant conflict between the national government and the several States in matters pertaining to the regulation of rates. It would be an incalculable blessing, both to the people and the companies, if the railway system of the United States could be treated as a national unit under Federal control only. It would then be possible to get a perspective view of the network of lines as a whole and to formulate a scheme of just and harmonious legislation, under which the railways of one section would be placed in proper relation to those of other sections, and the scale of taxation and the stringency of rate-regulation could be adapted and modified in accordance with local conditions.

At present it is the ambition and endeavor of each State to secure rates no higher—and perhaps a little lower—than its neighbor. Kansas sees no reason why it should not have as favorable rates as Missouri or Indiana; Missouri and Indiana will not tolerate any disadvantage as compared with Ohio, Ohio insists on equality with Pennsylvania and Massachusetts. Viewed by itself, the ambition of each individual State is intelligible and even praiseworthy; but the net result in practice is intolerable injustice to the railways of the more sparsely settled sections. The re-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cent decision of the Supreme Court will go a long way toward protecting the companies against this injustice.

Briefly, what the Supreme Court says is that a State legislature has no right to impose any rates for the carrying of freight or passengers which are not high enough to produce a "fair return" on the "fair value" of the property of the railway companies; also that the question whether any given rates are adequate or not is not a matter which a legislature can decide, but must ultimately be a subject of judicial inquiry.

This is far from being new doctrine. Former decisions had declared that the States' right of regulation "is itself not without limitation;" that railways "have the right to live;" that they cannot be compelled "to carry persons or property without reward;" that they are entitled to "some compensation" for their services over and above the cost of operation. In so far, therefore, as the court declares the right of railway companies to receive a return on the value of their properties it only re-enunciates well-established principles.

The court also, however, makes a definite approach to an authoritative definition of the basis on which the "fair value" of the properties is to be calculated. The decision says:

"In order to ascertain that value, the original cost of construction, the amount expended in permanent improvement, the amount and market value of its bonds and stock, the present as compared with the original cost of construction the probable earning capacity of the property under any rates prescribed by statute and the sum required to meet operating expenses, are all matters for consideration, and to be given such weight as may be just and right in the particular case. What the company is entitled to ask is a fair return upon the value of that which it employs for the public convenience."

One other sentence must be quoted:

"In our judgment, it must be held that the reasonableness or unreasonableness of rates prescribed by a State for the transportation of persons and property wholly within its limits must be determined without reference to the business of an interstate character done by the carrier, or to the profits derived from that business. The State cannot justify unreasonably low rates for domestic transportation, considered alone, upon the ground that the carrier is earning large profits on its interstate business, over which, so far as rates are concerned, the State has no control."

That is to say that the rates imposed in Nebraska (or in any other State) by the State Legislature must be such as will give a fair return on the railway properties *inside the State of Nebraska*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

measured by the volume of business *in Nebraska*. A railway company—say the Burlington road—cannot be compelled to do Nebraska business at unprofitable figures, on the ground that its lines in, perhaps, Illinois are so profitable that the company as a whole will still make money. There are some results, not yet generally recognized, which follow from this decision.

In the first place, the amount of that "fair value" of the railway properties is a question which will now press for authoritative settlement, even more urgently than heretofore. That it is an extremely large and complicated question is sufficiently shown by the fact that not long ago a scheme was formulated for presentation to Congress providing for the appointment of a commission to ascertain the present value of the railways of the country, which commission was to be allowed three years in which to complete the work and a million dollars for its expenses. Meanwhile, in the absence of any authoritative guidance, two widely differing sets of opinions are held on the subject. Railway officers and engineers with practical unanimity say that the railways could not be reproduced for, and are worth, the full face value of their capital stock and bonds, about $60,000 a mile. The opponents of the railways, especially the Populist politicians in Western States, declare that from $25,000 to $30,000 would be a liberal estimate for the lines of the country as a whole. This is not a question which can be discussed in this article, but we are at least safe in assuming that the lowest estimate made is too low, that is, that the fair value of the railways on the average is above $30,000 a mile.

That is to say that, on the average for the whole country, no schedule of rates which will not, on the volume of business done, produce a "fair return" on $30,000 a mile can be legally imposed on the railways.

This, as has been said, is on the average value of the properties of the railways of the United States as a whole. But the Supreme Court says that in any State the reasonableness of rates must be determined with reference to the railway lines and earnings in that State only. Henceforward, therefore, the statistics of the individual States are to be of importance. At present such railway statistics as are obtainable in the respective States (with the exception of a very few) are most unsatisfactory. Of the Western States, Texas is the only one which has made any effort

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to arrive at an accurate valuation of its railway properties, and the Texas valuations are not regarded with much confidence. Railway companies could not, except at enormous expense and inconvenience, make their operating divisions coincide with State boundaries; and to segregate accurately the right proportion of the earnings of all traffic passing over the lines inside State borders would be an almost impossible task. Only 32 States have any board or office—Railroad Commission or otherwise—which makes even a pretence of collecting and publishing the State railway statistics. The reports of some of the existing boards are entirely valueless, while from nearly all general conclusions for comparative purposes can be deduced only approximately and by laborious calculations of mileage and percentages.

None the less, we can with patience arrive at some figures from a majority of the States which will give us a nearly accurate idea of the relations of the railways of the different sections of the country to each other from the standpoint of their earning capacity, from which, by reference to such assumption as we can make of the "fair value" of the properties, we can in general terms see what possibilities there are, in view of the recent decision, of any legislative rate reductions in each State.

The public is pardonably distrustful of railway statistics as they emanate from the offices of individual companies. One item there is, however, in railway accounting which is never suspected of being manipulated, and it is the item which is most valuable for our present purpose. This is the total receipts from all traffic before those receipts are subjected to deductions in the companies' offices. The earnings before they appear in the form of "net income" may be frittered away in extravagance or mismanagement. The "balance available for dividends" is a deceitful and elusive quantity. But in the "gross earnings" we have one positive and trustworthy index. Given the gross earnings of all lines in a State, it is easy to find the average to the mile of road. This average is the *maximum* which, for purposes of State legislation, it is possible for the roads to earn. In practice some lines may earn more than their share and some less; but from the point of view of a legislature legislating for all roads alike, this average earning is the highest gross return which it is practicable for the railways to receive for their services.

Moreover (again recognizing that in practice there will be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

variations in the capacities of different roads) there is no difficulty in finding, so far as the State as a whole is concerned, what net profit these gross earnings ought to represent.

If a company pays all its expenses and taxes for 70 per cent. of its gross earnings, it is doing reasonably well. In the average Western State it is unusual for more than 7 or 8 per cent. of the gross earnings to get to the stockholder as dividends. But interest charges and other things have already been paid. If we allow 30 per cent. of the gross earnings as a balance available for all payments on capital (whether interest or dividend), as well as all "sinking fund" and "surplus" requirements, we are treating the railways fairly. The New York Central last year operated for 66.96 per cent. of its gross earnings; the Chicago & Alton (an admirably managed and economical road) got below 63 per cent.; the Wabash in its last report pointed with pride to the fact that it had its operating expenses down to 69.22 per cent.; the Boston & Maine spent 67.39. The Chicago & Northwestern got down to 61. According to the Interstate Commerce Commission, in the last six years the ratio of operating expenses to gross earnings on the railways of the country has varied between 66.6 per cent. (in 1892) and 68.14 per cent. (in 1894), the ratio last year having been 67.2 per cent. Taxes amounted to 3.5 per cent. of the gross earnings. The two together last year made 70.7 per cent. If we allow the companies, therefore, 70 per cent. of their gross earnings, on the average, for operation and to pay taxes, the remaining 30 per cent. is a fair allowance for net income. An average company—especially in the West—which keeps its expenses and tax payments inside of 70 per cent. of its gross, cannot be very extravagant, and legislators and the public have assurance that there are no excessive salaries or illegitimate profits, nor any "corruption funds" or other questionable items smuggled in to increase expense and keep down the dividend showing.

Of the 32 States which have railroad commissions (or similar bodies) there are 28 from whose reports it is possible to arrive at the gross earnings of all railways in the State with something like accuracy.

The following table shows these earnings per mile in each of these States, together with a calculation of the 30 per cent. available for net income, and, finally, on how much capital that net income will pay interest at the rate of 6 per cent.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

State.	Gross earnings per mile.	30 per cent. of gross earnings.	Being 6 per cent. upon :
North Carolina	$2,864	$859	$14,320
South Carolina	3,125	937	15,620
North Dakota	3,419	1,025	17,090
Georgia	3,484	1,045	17,420
Nebraska	3,487	1,046	17,433
Texas	3,742	1,122	18,710
Alabama	3,781	1,134	18,900
Michigan	3,835	1,150	19,170
Kansas	4,482	1,344	22,610
Missouri	4,768	1,430	23,860
Iowa	4,792	1,437	23,960
Wisconsin	5,346	1,603	26,730
Maine	5,446	1,633	27,230
Kentucky	6,003	1,800	30,010
Virginia	6,393	1,902	31,710
Minnesota	6,592	1,977	32,960
Illinois	6,806	2,041	34,030
California	8,199	2,459	40,990
Ohio	8,363	2,508	41,610
Massachusetts	10,118	3,035	50,590
New Hampshire	11,361	3,408	56,800
New York	13,787	4,136	68,980
Pennsylvania	15,103	4,530	75,510
Connecticut	15,698	4,709	78,490
Rhode Island	16,223	4,866	81,110
New Jersey	18,777	5,633	93,880
Vermont	18,932	5,679	94,660

This will be found to be an extraordinarily interesting table. Here we have that perspective view of the country as a whole which is necessary before any broad handling of the railway problem is possible.

The 30 per cent. of income to profit in each of the last two States is, it will be seen, larger than the whole gross earnings of any one of the first thirteen. Nothing could better illustrate the necessity of having some such basis of comparison than does the table itself. It is the demonstration of its own importance. To legislate for railways in a State where they cannot earn interest on $15,000 of capital on the same basis as in States where they can earn interest on over $94,000 is obviously absurd, though, as an abstract proposition, Western States will rarely recognize the fact.

In a general way railway men know that a road that earns $10,000 a mile, gross, is in moderately easy circumstances—or ought to be. With $8,000 a mile or less, there is need of economy. If the gross earnings are below $5,000 a mile, there must be difficulty in making both ends meet. The above figures show why this is so.

A road which earns $5,000 a mile, gross, after operating economically and paying its taxes, has not enough left to pay 6 per

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cent. interest on $25,000 a mile. That is a condition which sooner or later means bankruptcy.

A road which earns $8,000 a mile, gross, can operate and pay taxes and then have 6 per cent. left on $40,000 a mile. That is not a condition which permits of extravagance, because no road running through a region sufficiently populated to produce $8,000 a mile, gross, can have cost less than $40,000 a mile to build. But such a road should keep solvent.

A road which earns above $10,000 a mile ought to be able to operate and pay interest on $50,000 a mile without difficulty.

The States in the above table, then, fall naturally into three groups:

1. Those wherein the railways earn, gross, less than $5,000 a mile. This includes eleven States. The railways in the most prosperous of the eleven (Iowa) cannot as a whole earn interest on $24,000 a mile, while in the poorest (North Carolina) they cannot earn it on $15,000. Here we have certain concrete facts. These facts cannot be manipulated. There is no question here of watered stock, or of salaries, or dividends. The gross earnings are the maximum that the railways have to divide among them. The 30 per cent. balance is what each company, if it is alert in a business way so as to get its full share of the gross, and then operates economically so as not to spend too much, *ought to* be able to have left. When, on this basis of computation, a railroad, no matter how it behaves, cannot earn interest at six per cent. on $25,000 it is in a bad way. For the people of the States wherein the railways are shown to be in these circumstances to attempt to compel any lower rates than are now in force or to lay any other additional burdens on the companies, is, setting considerations of justice and the recent Supreme Court decision aside, most injudicious from the standpoint of public expediency. A company which (no matter how hard it works or how economically it operates) is permanently confronted by an inability to earn interest on $25,000 a mile cannot possibly continue for any long term of years to give the public adequate and safe service. However hard it may strive to keep up appearances, the condition of the property must deteriorate; accidents will grow more frequent; depot facilities will be inadequate; passenger accommodations will grow poorer, and, most certainly of all, there will not be cars and engines enough to move crops or

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

handle any extraordinary business when the emergency arises. It will not be the fault of the railway company. The responsibility rests on the conditions of the territory in which it operates. It cannot furnish a first-class service on an inadequate volume of business any more than a general store in a small town can offer the same advantages to its customers as are furnished by a great New York house. There is probably no other country in the world wherein railway companies attempt to operate on a business which will produce less than $5,000 a mile gross earnings, unless they have a guarantee of aid from the government. In this country it would be a far wiser policy for the people—through the federal government or through the States—to assist the roads in unprofitable localities than to talk of imposing new burdens. In almost all—so far as is known, in all—other countries this is done.

The States in which, as we see from the above list, there is not business enough to produce a profit on railway operation are the following:

North Carolina,
South Carolina,
North Dakota,
Georgia,
Nebraska,
Texas,
Alabama,
Michigan,
Kansas,
Missouri,
Iowa.

Other States there are for which the figures are not available, but which undoubtedly fall in the same category. These are:

North Dakota,
Montana,
Washington,
Oregon,
Arizona,
Oklahoma,
New Mexico,
Nevada,
Utah,
Wyoming,
Florida,
Mississippi,
Indian Territory,
Colorado,
and probably
Louisiana.

In all of these States it would be an incomparably wiser policy to lighten the burdens of the railways as much as possible, and to encourage them to keep their properties in fitting condition to give adequate public service, rather than to attempt to further curtail revenues which are already inadequate.

But it is not necessary now to reason only on grounds of public expediency. The Supreme Court of the United States has furnished a more powerful argument. The recent decision places an absolute veto in the way of any legislation in any one of these twenty-six States which will reduce rates or cut down earnings.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In each and every one of them, no law which by any amount, however small, adds to the burdens of the railway companies can be constitutional.

2. The next group of States is that wherein the railways receive on an average between $5,000 and $8,500 a mile, gross. As we see from the above table, a company which earns above $5,000 a mile, gross, may, if it is properly managed, pay interest on an investment of $25,000 a mile. If it earns above $8,000 a mile, gross, it ought to be able to pay interest on $40,000 a mile. The average bonded debt of the railways of the country is $30,126 a mile. The figures given above (see Kentucky) show that it takes $6,000 a mile gross earnings to earn 6 per cent. interest on this amount. Roads, therefore, which earn between $5,000 and $6,000 a mile, gross, are likely to have need of rigid economy before they can meet their interest payments. With more than $6,000 a mile gross earnings, there is a possibility of earning some dividend on stocks. With $8,000 a mile, gross, a company should be able to pay 6 per cent. on the average bonded debt, and, in addition, 6 per cent. on $10,000 (or 3 per cent. on $20,000) of stock to the mile. This is by no means affluence. Take Ohio for example, where the average gross earnings are $8,363 a mile, and California, where the gross earnings are $8,199 a mile. In the former State the number of large cities, where terminals are costly, and in the latter the heavy mountain passes with their great engineering difficulties, and the expensiveness of labor and supplies, have made the railways there cost considerably more than the $41,810 and the $40,990 a mile on which the volume of business permits an earning of interest at 6 per cent.

The Supreme Court, it has been seen, plainly stipulates that in addition to the "original cost of construction," the "amount expended in permanent improvements" and "the market value of the stocks and bonds" are also to be taken into consideration in ascertaining the "fair value" of the properties. In at least two of the States in this group legislation is now threatened to reduce passenger fares. The railway companies will have no difficulty whatever in showing any such legislation to be plainly confiscatory and unconstitutional. The States in this group are:

Wisconsin,	Minnesota,
Maine,	Illinois,
Kentucky,	California,
Virginia,	Ohio.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

To which may be added:

West Virginia,	Delaware,
Tennessee,	Maryland.

3. There remain on our list eight States which show an average earning capacity of $10,000 and upward. In these the question of whether any legislation could be enacted which would reduce earnings, without cutting below the limit of a fair return, is less easily decided. The opinion of the writer is that on the Eastern lines as a whole, with very few exceptions, the cost of permanent improvements out of capital, since the lines were originally built, has been so great that even the present earnings do no more than make a fair return on the value of the properties. It is not, however, in these States that the pressure for anti-railway legislation is most active. It is in the States of the South and West, and the magnitude of the benefit of the Supreme Court's decision to the railways of these sections will only come to be understood slowly and with the passage of time.

HARRY PERRY ROBINSON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WOMEN AND THE LABOR MOVEMENT.

BY M. E. J. KELLEY.

AN observant philosopher discoursing on the labor movement in America remarked, somewhat disconsolately: "With the women of the country rests much of the blame for the slow progress of the labor movement. Upon womankind falls the greater part of the purchasing and in her efforts to secure bargains she overlooks the true economic feature of the case. She thinks only of the present. It is a case where the so-called economic guiding motive of self-interest overreaches itself. The self-interest of the present defeats the self-interest of the long run. Any state of things for which women can be induced to make a concerted demand will be forthcoming. It is only ignorance on the part of women that stands in the way of rational progressive living for the great mass of human beings. The real labor problem is how to bring women to a knowledge of their social responsibilities and duties."

While there is an Adam-like tone of blame for the woman about the labor-philosopher's remarks, they voice a growing appreciation of woman's importance as an economic factor. The changes in economic thought which tend more and more to place the emphasis on consumption and to consider women as the great factors in determining what shall be consumed, indicate that women must be very seriously considered in the solution of the problems of industrial production. The economic and sociological needs of the time furnish an overlooked argument for the cultivation of the mental powers of women. Since they are the determining factors in consumption they need, even more than men, the power of generalizing, ability to see the broad field, and estimate the general effect of particular deeds.

All sorts of people talk a great deal about the labor move-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment nowadays, but there seems to be a general hazy vagueness about their terminology. As a matter of fact there is no regularly organized labor movement with definite aims and plan of action. The Knights of Labor represent one movement, the American Federation of Labor another, while the Social Democracy and the Socialists, idealist, materialist, Christian, or Marxian are seeking a similar goal by quite different routes. All have points of agreement, to be sure, and of late there seems to be a growing tendency on the part of the more powerful labor organizations to make themselves class factors in politics.

Everywhere the labor movement means the struggle of the workers and their sympathizers to secure a better home-life, more healthful conditions in workshops, educational opportunities, and all the rights and privileges of citizenship for men and women, time and opportunity to develop the spiritual and the beautiful side of their lives and characters as well as the money-making side. Broadly speaking, the labor movement means simply the sum of all the efforts of all sorts of people to elevate the physical, mental, and moral character of the producers, through the improvement of the material conditions which surround them. In this sense the college settlements, the social settlements, the Church Association for the Improvement of the Condition of the Poor, the farmers' grange, the social reform clubs, the Christian Socialists, the working-girls' clubs, are all a part of the labor movement, as well as the American Federation of Labor and the assemblies of the Knights of Labor.

Two classes of women are more or less prominent in all these organizations—those doing and those done for; those who are wage-earners and those who are not. The wage-earners may be classed in the trade-unions, Knights of Labor, and working girls' clubs; the non-wage-earners in college and social settlements, Women's Christian Temperance Union, farmers' granges, Consumers' Leagues, etc.

Perhaps a third class should be added—the women who are neither wage-earners nor women of leisure—the home-keeping wives and mothers of workingmen. Sometimes, to be sure, their influence is all against the union and the labor movement, but in most instances they back their breadwinners with heroic fealty in any fight for more wages, shorter hours, or anything else the union thinks it right to ask. Upon them,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

too, falls the brunt of the fight. They know better than any statistician how much wages are lost and how little food a family can live on during a strike. And rarely does their faith or hopefulness waver. Not infrequently, as in the case of the coal miners' strike last summer, they not only bear the suffering incidental to all strikes with heroic patience, but they bring mother-wit to help in the solution of the problems of the strikers. They picket shops and try persuasion on renegades; that failing they take advantage of the partial immunity their sex gives them and use measures to disable the "scabs" who have taken their husbands' places.

The woman of leisure is a comparatively new factor. It is scarcely a generation since titled ladies in England began to use their wealth and position and superior education for the betterment of the conditions under which their wage-earning sisters were employed. In the United States the appearance of the woman of wealth or leisure or culture in the labor movement is of still more recent date. The sudden development of the Knights of Labor in the early eighties began it. Many teachers, women physicians, and other women following intellectual pursuits found themselves drawn by that force into the militant labor movement. Miss Dodge, daughter of a New York millionaire, followed with her working-girls' clubs as a scheme for the improvement, through the development of character, of factory workers. About the same time Mrs. Josephine Shaw Lowell, widow of Gen. Charles Russell Lowell, turned her attention to the organization of Boards of Conciliation and Arbitration in trades already having strong unions, with such success that there have been few or no strikes among the bricklayers and masons in New York, Boston, or Chicago for fifteen years.

The development of college and social settlements drew to the movement women of wealth and culture, particularly in Chicago and Boston where the settlement workers are in close touch with the trade unions. In Boston the women of Dennison House are members of a federal labor union and have organized a union of women engaged in the tailoring trade. The head-worker at the settlement is a delegate to the Central Labor Union. Hull House, Chicago, is likewise represented in the local federation of trade unions. It also furnishes a meeting place for unions and courses of lectures on economics.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Women of social position have lent their influence to the agitation for legislative inquiries into the conditions under which women are employed, the establishment of bureaus of labor statistics, the passage of factory inspection laws, and the appointment of women factory inspectors, all of which are of recent accomplishment and testify to the influence of women in the labor movement. Nowhere else indeed are the college graduates, the women most representative of the advantages and opportunities gained by women in this century, more conspicuous than among the social reformers.

The labor movement in this country may be divided into two periods, the first extending from 1800 to 1861, and the second from the Civil War to the present time. With the first period women of any class had little to do, and women of leisure, wealth, or culture, nothing at all. It was not until the 40's, when the tide of immigration set in, that women began to be factors worth considering at all in industrial production, and it was not until after the war that inventions and changes in methods, together with the great number of women thrown on their own resources by the death of the breadwinners in the war, made women of importance in economic affairs. While the economic position of woman was being revolutionized, democratic ideals were changing, organization was progressing rapidly among workingmen, middle-class women were wringing opportunities for higher education from the conservative keepers of colleges, the agitation for political privileges for women reached a stage where it began to be taken seriously, and all these things together tended to bring women to the front and to interest the public in their affairs.

Odd enough it must seem to those who believe women chronically opposed to warfare, that in the period before the war woman's appearance in the labor movement was usually as a riotous striker. Strikes were not infrequent and they were nearly always hopeless in those early days when imprisonment was apt to be the portion of the daring spirit who injured his employers by refusing to work for whatever his benefactor chose to pay him. But in spite of the danger women were in the thick of the fray. There were women among the mill hands of Paterson, N. J., who struck in 1834 for a reduction of hours. The factory regulations required all hands, men, women, and children, from seven years upward, to be at work at half-past four in the morn-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing. The strikers were willing to work thirteen hours a day, but they drew the line at that. Their demands were finally conceded. Less successful were those famous mill girls of Lowell of whom Dickens and Harriet Martineau spoke with such admiration. They have been held up as models for all future generations of mill girls. The fact that they went on strike in 1836 is rarely mentioned, however. The ringleader was an eleven-year-old girl. It is said, when a reduction of wages was announced, she led her comrades out of the mill, and mounting a pump made an inflammatory speech. She was promptly chastised and sent back to her work, and the revolt ended then and there.

The first definite step toward an organized labor movement was the holding of a convention of representatives from workingmen's associations in Baltimore in 1866. The anti-slavery and women's rights agitations had accustomed the people somewhat to women as speakers on public platforms, but they were not women of the working class, and it was, perhaps, too much to expect women delegates to be present at that first convention. Even at this time, however, there were some strong trades organizations having women on their membership rolls. One of the most powerful was the Order of the Knights of St. Crispin, a union of shoemakers. The women of the trade were organized in a special branch called the Daughters of St. Crispin.

Although there were no women representatives at the convention of 1866, the women wage-earners were not overlooked, though the remedies proposed for their wrongs could hardly have conveyed much hope to those of them who interested themselves in the proceedings.

In the platform of principles to which the delegates declared their fealty there were two planks relating to women. The first ran thus: "Resolved, that with the equal application of the fundamental principles of our republican democratic government and a sound monetary system, there could be no antagonism between the interests of the workingmen and the workingwomen of this country, nor between any branches of productive industry, the direct operation of each, when not prevented by unjust monetary laws, being to benefit all the others by the production and distribution of the comforts and necessaries of life; and that the adoption by the government of the financial policy set forth in this platform will put an end to the oppression of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

workingwomen and is the only means of securing to them, as to workingmen, the just rewards of their labor."

A greenback financial policy could hardly have conveyed much uplift to the poorly paid sewing women who were suffering just then not only from insufficient wages but from inability to collect the too small price of their hire. The sudden outpouring from the home into the market of women unused to the ways of the business world was probably too tempting an opportunity to the unscrupulous to be allowed to pass. So great was the evil that public attention was drawn to it, and in New York the Working Women's Protective Union was organized for the express purpose of collecting the wages of which women were defrauded.

The most important feature of the convention at Baltimore, so far as its doings related to women, was the changed attitude shown by workingmen toward the women who were rapidly invading the trades hitherto monopolized by men. Women were taken up on a level with men as wage-earners. Outspoken antagonism to their entrance into trades and trades-unions was classed as out of order. Woman's right to equal wages for equal work was clearly recognized. Her wrongs were noted, and the desire to help her to help herself was recorded. Another resolution was adopted: "Resolved, that we pledge our individual and undivided support to the sewing women and daughters of toil in the land, and would solicit their hearty co-operation, knowing as we do that no class of industry is so much in need of having their condition ameliorated as the factory operatives and sewing women of this country." Still again, it was resolved that "women are entitled to equal pay for equal services with men; that the practice of working women and children ten to fifteen hours a day at starvation prices is brutal in the extreme, and subversive of the health, intelligence and morality of the nation, and demands the interposition of law."

Altogether the convention marked an epoch in the relation of the American workingwoman to the labor movement. Workingmen recognized her as an economic factor. Objection to her entrance into trades could no longer be organized or official. Her eligibility to membership in trade unions was hereafter to be based on the same grounds as applied to any other worker. Immigration no doubt had considerable effect on the situation. The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

establishment of new industries after the war attracted many skilled workmen from England and Scotland and Germany. Among other things they brought with them their trade-union notions. Women were members of the German cigarmakers' unions and the American cigarmakers' union was very young, indeed, when women were first admitted to membership. The textile industry developed amazingly in the years following the war and thousands of English and Scotch spinners and weavers came to work in the mills. It was among these people and in this particular industry that modern trade-unionism first developed. Women had always been members of the unions; in fact, at Oldham, in England, one of the centres of the industry, the membership was almost equally divided between the sexes.

With the coming of the Knights of Labor the distinctively American woman became for the first time conspicuous in the labor movement. One of the marked peculiarities of the phase of the labor movement which flowed and ebbed in the decade of the eighties was the position of the Knights of Labor on the woman question and the attitude of women towards the order. Possibly because the founders, being tailors, were personally intimate with the sewing trade, the order was convinced that workingwomen were even more oppressed than men and that no permanent good could come to the masses until this lower layer of the social structure should have been elevated. Consequently Knights of Labor everywhere endeavored to ameliorate the conditions under which women were employed. Woman was urged to throw off her traditional yoke of meekness and dependence, and encouraged to become the valiant woman, strong in the cause of righteousness. When girls struck either against indecent treatment—no unusual cause apparently ten or fifteen years ago—or for fair conditions or wages, large sums of money were raised to support them. In other directions the Knights of Labor took up the cudgels in defence of women. The order demanded from its members proper treatment of women, and failure to fall in line with the general enlightened view of the rights of woman, even when she was a member's own wife, was sometimes followed by a social boycott. The story is told of a Knight of Labor who abused his wife in spite of many warnings. Finally he was expelled from the local assembly. Unable to get work in his own town, he went to Canada to escape

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the opprobrium in which he was held. But even there he found that word had gone ahead of him to the Canadian Knights to have nothing to do with "the unworthy scoundrel, who was a disgrace to the order."

Any estimate of the total number of women who have been Knights of Labor must be pure guesswork, as the number constantly fluctuated. One hundred and fifty, even two hundred thousand would probably be quite within bounds. In New York alone, in 1887, it is said there were 60,000 women in seventy-five local assemblies. In 1885, in Haverhill, Mass., a centre of the shoemaking industry, there were seven assemblies, one having a membership of 800 women. The women in the Knights of Labor were not all workingwomen. All classes were admitted to membership except bankers, lawyers, and saloon-keepers, and many women of leisure and others distinguished in intellectual ways were active workers in the order.

To the strict trade-unionist who believes that only by a thorough organization of all trades can any real good come to workingmen or workingwomen there is something particularly discouraging in the history of women in the labor movement, considering it in its narrow sense. It has been with all women's trade-unions as with the Knights of Labor. A sort of fever of enthusiasm possesses the members for a year or two. They plan and dream glorious things and act rashly. Then they fall back into their old apathetic attitude, and the labor movement, so far as they are concerned, appears to be retrogressing until a new generation of workers appears. Five years after the Knights of Labor was at the height of its power, and had 150,000 women in its ranks, it would have been difficult to find 10,000 women Knights of Labor from one end of the land to the other. The Federation of Labor has never appealed to women as strongly as did the Knights of Labor. Except in trades in which both men and women are employed, there are very few women in the Federation. At present it is estimated that about ten per cent. of the workingmen of the country belong to some sort of a labor union, and only one per cent. of the women.

The influence of a labor organization, however, cannot be measured by its membership at any given time, nor can its influence upon the position or condition of women wage-earners be measured by the number of women in its ranks. While it is dif-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ficult to point to specific concessions from employers in the way of reduced hours or increased wages, a broad view of the field shows that the labor movement in the second period of its development has brought great improvements for working women. Out of the agitation and co-operation of the many forces which go to make the modern labor movement, have come the factory laws and the women factory inspectors, laws which give married women the right to their own wages, laws which help them to recover their wages from dishonest employers.

Public opinion is after all the great power in the improvement of conditions, and the most important effect of the agitation aroused by the Knights of Labor and continued by the American Federation, the moulding of public opinion, is often overlooked. Leonora Barry, a mill girl of Schenectady, who was blacklisted for her prominence in a strike, was commissioned by the national officers of the Knights of Labor to investigate the conditions under which women were employed. It was the first systematic inquiry of its kind, and the widespread publicity given her findings was most influential in calling public attention to many evils, and in forming public opinion on labor questions. The National Labor Bureau, then only recently formed, set its machinery at work on a similar investigation. Several State bureaus undertook to unearth the facts within their own territory. Shocked individuals and disbelieving private societies began investigations on their own account. Legislation to remedy flagrant abuses speedily followed.

The reiterated declaration that women should receive equal pay for equal work has not been without results. The injustice of the present inequality is more generally recognized, and there is a growing tendency toward equality of wages—in public employment at least. The attitude of men toward the problem is changing. That a man is supposed always to have a family to support, and a woman never, is rarely urged nowadays, as it was once, as sufficient reason for paying women smaller wages. Recently the Mayor of New York came out boldly in favor of equal wages for equal work for men and women teachers in the public schools. Public education associations have been formed for the purpose of bringing about equality of wages for teachers. Indirectly this must influence other occupations. "Equal wages for equal work" is more important now than ever, because the easily

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

operated machine makes women as skillful workers as men. If the notion that women ought to receive less wages prevails the man's standard must come down toward hers.

The labor movement has always stood for greater educational opportunities for the workers, and this phase of the agitation is having its effect on workingwomen and on the home. Technical training, art education, the teaching of domestic economy, which are gradually being made a part of the public school system, will have much to do with raising the standard of living. The club movement among women is teaching the value of organization and co-operation, is unconsciously broadening women's sympathies and breaking down false ideals and artificial barriers. The impetus toward all these things was given by the labor movement, and they are gradually bringing women into the labor movement. From it all is coming recognition that the greatest need of the time is education on sociological questions and the development of the idea of social responsibilities. Two classes of women have become factors, and a third (or is it a fourth ?) class, the most important of all, remains to be reached. For, after all, the women who are in the majority, the women who are the great industrial power, are those who are neither rich nor poor, neither students, nor society butterflies, nor working girls, the great body of ordinary women whose time is given up to taking care of their households, to buying the supplies for their families, and thereby keeping the whole industrial machinery in motion. Could they once be brought to a knowledge of their importance in the economic circle, made to feel that the buying of so small a thing as a spool of thread is a social function, a lot of vexing problems would speedily be solved. The labor movement of the past has concerned itself with women as producers; the labor movement of the future must deal with womankind in her more important capacity as a consumer.

M. E. J. KELLEY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE DECAY OF COBDENISM IN ENGLAND.

BY JOHN P. YOUNG.

In December, 1845, at a meeting of the Anti-Corn-Law League, held in Manchester, England, it was resolved to raise $1,250,000, to be used in forwarding the free-trade movement. Three hundred thousand dollars were subscribed in one day. Twenty-three men put down their names for $5,000 each, and the secretary could hardly record the subscriptions fast enough to suit the eager subscribers. M. M. Trumbull, who wrote the story of "The Free-Trade Struggle in England," says: "Nothing could stand against such earnest public opinion as that." Manifestations of earnestness which take the form of liberal subscriptions are usually impressive, and often achieve their object. This one did, for on the ensuing 28th of February the Free Traders carried their point, the House of Commons abolishing the corn laws by the decisive vote of 337 to 240.

It is a little more than half a century since this action was taken by England. During the interval the kingdom has made tremendous progress and is now rated as the richest country on the face of the globe. Its manufactures have expanded enormously, and until very recently its external commerce was continuously increasing. The population, which was less than 17,000,000 in 1846, now exceeds 40,000,000, and the financiers of the city of London are the dominating influence in the monetary world.

These facts are known to all Englishmen, yet it may be safely asserted that if Richard Cobden were alive to-day, and should attempt to raise a subscription fund in Manchester to buttress the free-trade idea, he could not secure pence where formerly pounds sterling were subscribed with alacrity. On November 30, 1897, the annual meeting of the Cobden Club was held in London, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

there were just thirteen persons present. The total income for the year amounted to the insignificant sum of £668, mostly contributed in the form of dues by men who are animated more by the pride of opinion than by a glowing conviction that the interests of England would be subserved by adhering rigidly to the gospel of free trade as formulated by the Manchester school of economists.

This apparent lack of interest in Cobdenism might be attributed to a feeling of assurance of success, if the English reviews and the daily press of that country were not teeming with articles tending to discredit the theories of the Manchester school, and manifesting a decided uneasiness regarding the commercial future of Great Britain. The men most ardently committed to the free trade idea a few years ago are now admitting that it is possible that their theories were at fault. Prof. L. L. Price, in a recent discussion of "The Present Condition of Economic Science," epitomizes the state of English opinion on this subject when he says that professed economists "may still insist on the practical objections existing to governmental interference in the shape of protection; but they would be prepared to admit that the contentions of many free traders had been expressed too absolutely, and that a broader review of possibilities and a wider survey of facts might suggest modifications in the current doctrines."

When we consider this statement closely it is at once seen that it amounts to an admission that the fundamental ideas of the Cobdenites have been overturned. A very slight familiarity with the writings of the Manchester school of economists exhibits the fact that their system was based on the assumption that the adoption of free trade by England would compel other nations to resort to the same system as a measure of self-defence, and that they were profoundly convinced that it would be impossible for a people to artificially develop an industry with government aid so that it could rival or compete with those established at the time the corn laws were abolished. That this does not overstate the case the remarks of Professor J. Thorold Rogers, in his paper on "Free Trade" in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* demonstrates. This distinguished champion said: "Protection discourages all kinds of improvement, and indeed it does not appear that the phenomenon of sudden, vast and permanent progress

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has ever been witnessed in economical history except during the latter half of the eighteenth century in England."

If Professor Rogers were alive to-day he would carefully avoid such an argument and might even be induced to admit that he made a serious blunder in assuming that "protection discourages all kinds of improvement," and that he was totally in error when in 1889, in the course of one of his lectures delivered in the hall of Worcester College, he declared that, although "thirty years ago and more the American people were noted for the invention of labor-saving machines, the faculty . . . has been notoriously discouraged and is in no way so prolific as it used to be."

If Professor Rogers, with all of the opportunities of a specialist to obtain information, could be deceived on so vital a point as this, it is not surprising that the mass of Englishmen who were content to accept without question the assertions of their leading economists should have been misled. What would be more natural for a British manufacturer than to despise a rival who, he was assured, was constantly deteriorating in ability because he was the victim of an erroneous commercial policy? What could be better calculated to continue the delusion that the adoption of free trade by England had made it impossible for rivals depending upon protection to successfully compete than an apparently well authenticated statement that the effect of state aid was to sap the energies and weaken or destroy the inventive capacity of a people? How different an impression would have been produced had the English economic authority frankly given the figures which show that the number of patents issued in the United States had increased from 4,504 in 1859 to 24,158 in 1889, and admitted that a very large proportion of the inventions of the later years were in the field in which he declared we were growing negligent.

The English economists, who eagerly adopted his view of decadence under protection, also misled their followers in another fashion. They persistently affirmed that in protective countries the consumer was obliged to pay extravagantly for the privilege of being protected. "I do not deny that British manufacture and trade are hindered by the protective tariff of other countries," said Professor Rogers in one of his lectures. "The law allows the subject of it to buy one pair of boots where he might buy two

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pairs, and stints him in many ways." No Englishman could seriously accept such a statement as this, and fear a rival working under a system so repressive of consumption as protection was then declared to be. It is true that Professor Rogers occasionally made admissions which negatived the idea that the mass of people in protected countries were any the worse off for paying higher prices for what they consumed while the process of building up a manufacturing industry was in progress, but they were overlooked by the Cobdenites, who eagerly accepted as true every charge discrediting protection. Such assertions as that "the voluntary emigration (from England) of colonists anxious to better themselves in their own way of life" was a phenomenon worth noting, and that the movement was "in the largest degree to the United States," were unheeded, and the British manufacturer and the English people continued to hug the delusion that protection must ultimately work the ruin of those who depended upon it, even though they might temporarily appear prosperous.

In addition to the propensity to underrate the achievements of rivals present and prospective, the English economists were guilty of erroneously attributing to the operations of free trade, a prosperity which might easily have been traced to a wholly different cause. Singularly enough writers like Rogers could speak of "the discoveries of Arkwright, of Watt, of Hargreaves, of Crompton, giving England a practical monopoly of textile fabrics, and subsequently of other products nearly as important," and fail to perceive that it was this practical monopoly which really secured for England the lead she obtained when the gold discoveries in America and Australia revivified commerce. Professor Lecky, in his recently published *Democracy and Liberty*, tells us that "it is more and more repeated that the great rush of prosperity that undoubtedly followed the repeal of the corn laws was largely due to the gigantic discoveries which kept up prices while they stimulated enterprise," but the allusions to such a contributory cause were few during the period of English prosperity, and when made they fell on unheeding ears.

John Stuart Mill, who wrote his *Principles of Political Economy* at a time when the effects of the discoveries of gold in California and Australia were just beginning to make themselves felt, was astute enough to perceive and predict that they might prove "the commencement of another period of declining value

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the metal." The effect of such a decline, or, to put it in another way, of the increased abundance of gold, is described by him in Book 3, Chapter VIII., paragraph 2, where he used this illustration :

"Suppose, everything else being the same, there is an increase in the quantity of money, say by the arrival of a foreigner in a place, with a treasure of gold and silver. When he commences expending it (for this question it matters not whether productively or unproductively), he adds to the supply of money, and by the same act to the demand for goods. Doubtless he adds, in the first instance, only to the demand for certain kinds of goods, namely, those which he selects for purchase; he will immediately raise the price of these, and so far as he is concerned of these only. If he spends his funds in giving entertainments, he will raise the prices of food and wine. If he expends them in establishing a manufactory, he will raise the prices of labor and materials. But at the higher prices more money will pass into the hands of the sellers of these different articles; and they, whether laborers or dealers, having more money to lay out, will create an increased demand for all the things which they are accustomed to purchase; these accordingly will rise in price and so on until the rise has reached everything."

Had Englishmen carefully studied the import of these words they might have avoided a serious blunder, but unfortunately the disciples of Mill concentrated their attention on the last clause of the paragraph, which carries the argument that prices would ultimately be equalized in the event of a rise such as that described, and completely missed the significance of the observation that during the time the rise was in progress great profit might be derived by those ready to take advantage of the situation. The English were prepared. Professor Rogers tells us that the discoveries of Arkwright, of Watt, of Hargreaves, of Crompton, had at this time given England a practical monopoly of textile and subsequently of other products equally important, and when the facts regarding the development of trade in the period immediately succeeding the discoveries of gold referred to are investigated we find his observation amply justified. Inquiry shows that in 1848 English manufacturers were so vastly in advance of those of other nations that the latter were practically non-competing. For many years Englishmen held a virtual monopoly in the iron and steel trade. They supplied the major part of the material consumed by the United States in the construction of its vast system of railways, and at prices which yielded them enormous profits. How great these profits were may be gathered from a table prepared by the writer a number of years ago for the purpose of displaying the fact that they

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

appeared to be governed solely by the American demand for rails and other supplies of iron and steel. When activity in railroad building began in the United States the prices of English rails were at once advanced nearly to the point prohibitive of use, and as soon as signs of depression exhibited themselves in this country they were at once marked down. The fluctuations were enormous during the period between 1850 and the date when American production began to make its influence felt. Mulhall furnishes tables of English prices which show that rails were sold in Liverpool in dull periods for half the price obtained for them when railroads were being constructed in the United States at the rate of eight or ten thousand miles a year.

What is true of iron and steel is equally true of textile and other manufactures. The development of these industries in England was so much in advance of that of other countries that during the period when the mines of California and Australia were yielding a hundred million or more annually that nation was in a position to derive the chief benefit of the discoveries of treasure. They exchanged their manufactured goods for Californian and Australian gold, and waxed immensely rich in consequence. The jargon of the economists has a tendency to disguise this fact, but it cannot deceive the investigator who seeks for causes and studies effects, and who will not be put off with phrases. Mr. Mill's assertion that "money is a mere instrument for exchanging things against one another," and his declaration that "the pounds or shillings which a person receives weekly or yearly are not what constitute his income, but are merely a sort of tickets or orders which he can present for payment at any shop he pleases, and which entitle him to receive a certain value of any commodity that he may make choice of," coupled with the observation that Great Britain acts on the principle that it is not wise to allow treasure to remain unemployed, have caused most Cobdenites to overlook the fact that it was during the time when England was in a position to almost monopolize the markets of the world that she accumulated and invested the greater part of the $15,000,000,000, which is said to be now owing to her by foreigners, and the earnings of which account for the major portion of the $630,000,000 annually drawn from the rest of the world, in excess of the value of the yearly exports of British produce.

It is the rude awakening of the English public to the errors

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the free trade economists which must be held responsible for the contempt into which Cobdenism has fallen. The Briton still lustily contends that free trade would be the best thing for mankind if the whole world would accept it, but he is rapidly abandoning the idea, carefully inculcated by Cobden, Bright, and others, that British prosperity would force other nations to follow her example in this particular. He now sees the fallacy of the expectation once entertained in England that other peoples, would attribute the start gained by the British in the commercial race to the superiority of English artisans over all others, and he is beginning to perceive that the most elaborately formulated economic maxims will be rejected by practical men if their instincts tell them that the lessons of the teachers and the logic of facts are not in harmony.

The extent of the revolution of sentiment in England may be inferred from the fact that Cobdenism scarcely finds a defender in that country at present, while the reviews and newspapers are filled with articles confessing the disappointment of the writers and urging plans to arrest the decadence of trade. In June, 1896, Edward Salmon, in a sketch entitled "From Cobden to Chamberlain," published in the *Fortnightly*, said: "Cobdenism is less and less recognized as an impregnable fiscal fortress, and the attack becomes more and more confident. Cobdenism is on the defensive." Sir Howard Vincent, in a letter written to the London *Times* in the latter part of 1896, complained that £80,504,991 worth of foreign manufactures were imported into the United Kingdom in a single year, and pointed out that "the £40,000,000 of British wages paid to foreign workers (for making these goods) came in part from the interest of millions sent to foreign countries to enable them to compete with us (the British) in manufacture and to oust us from their markets, instead of being employed in the development of domestic (British) resources." Canon MacColl wrote in the *Fortnightly* in December, 1895: "Let Russia, for the sake of argument, get possession of Asia Minor, and let her impose protective duties to her heart's content, she would nevertheless so develop the boundless resources of those countries that England, the carrier nation in chief of the world, would benefit incalculably;" but his attempt at consolation was rejected, and it was pointed out that rival nations were also developing their carrying trade, and would soon

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be in a position to compete with Englishmen on the ocean. In an article in the *New Review* of November, 1896, Williams, the author of "Made in Germany," pointed out that "when the last attempt was made to get rid of foreign sugar bounties, nearly every trade union in the country (England) petitioned in favor of the bill for ratifying the convention," which is only another mode of saying that the British workingman no longer finds the "cheap-loaf" argument alluring.

Professor Lecky also has something to say regarding the change of opinion on this subject. In his *Democracy and Liberty* he declares that "even this last article (of the free-trade belief, cheap food) is not generally held without qualification. Cheap food, it is beginning to be said, does not necessarily mean the very cheapest, and a system under which the greatest and most important of all national industries is almost hopelessly paralyzed, under which land is falling out of cultivation, and the agricultural population flocking more and more to the congested towns, cannot be really good for the nation." No one attempted to controvert his statement, but many bitterly recalled the fact that Cobden and his fellow free-traders had, during the "fifties," assured the English farmer that he enjoyed a natural protection which would always give him the command of the British markets. Captain Lugard, an English army officer, whose experience in Africa qualified him to speak, wrote several articles on "New British Markets," which appeared in the *Nineteenth Century* in 1895. In one of these (September, 1895) he said: "Cotton is another product which it would be of great importance to our industries to obtain from within the bounds of our own empire, instead of being dependent for the raw material on which the chiefest of our manufactures depends upon a foreign country and a commercial rival;" and in another place he argued that all the coffee Englishmen required could also be produced within the boundaries of the empire. His suggestions were received with applause, and, so far as we know, not one Cobdenite lifted up his voice to protest against the assault on the free-trade tenet that it is necessary to buy from rivals in order to sell to them.

The *Westminster* of May, 1896, contained a paper on "Agricultural Depression Unmasked," by Hopkins, whose socialistic writings have attracted some attention. In it he derided the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

remedy suggested by Gladstone, and said: "To bring about an alteration in these matters, to destroy the components of agricultural depression, would necessitate the enactment of State control or supervision of agricultural tenancy, with plain and uncomplicated rules and regulations, entirely independent of the caprice or selfish motive of landlord or agent." The significant thing about this rebuke is the fact that it was meekly accepted, the free-traders recognizing that a condition of affairs had been brought about by Cobdenism which they saw could only be mended by abandoning the doctrine of *laissez faire*. Mr. Gladstone's action in the case of Ireland and his recommendations regarding small land holdings show that he had completely lost sight of a fundamental theory of the Cobdenites, that State assistance to an industry must be pernicious. W. R. Bousefield, in the December, 1896, *Contemporary*, discussing the problem of unemployed labor, pointed out that while the free-trade policy had conferred benefits on England it had "at the same time enlarged the element of instability." He says: "We have ceased to produce for our own consumption a large number of articles which we can obtain more cheaply from abroad, and the industries concerned in the manufacture of the goods which we exchange for such articles has become correspondingly inflated. This is all for the best, so long as the products of these inflated industries are taken in exchange by the foreigner, but the moment his hostile tariffs exclude these goods our inflated industries collapse and the workers join the unemployed. This is one of the penalties we pay for the advantages of free trade, but it is daily becoming a more urgent question whether we cannot keep these advantages at less cost." The only rejoinder to this from free-traders is the one framed by Mallock, who retorted that if England was not capable of sustaining a greater population than 15,000,000, her surplus workingmen would have to betake themselves to other countries.

These quotations illustrating the decadence of Cobdenism could be multiplied indefinitely, but it is not necessary to pile up the evidence when we have the declaration of Lord Salisbury, made a few months ago in an after-dinner speech, that "the collective Briton is as timid as a woman when the barest suggestion is made of continental activity." In this brief sentence was recorded a mighty change. From being at one time the most

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bumptious and self-confident people in commercial matters, the English have become the most timid. Instead of, as formerly, proclaiming that "the world is their oyster," English writers now scare their readers with stories of the superior abilities of rivals and dark hints of future decay. The attitude of the whole nation is profoundly pessimistic, and even during the brief period when poets were singing the glories of the Victorian reign they occasionally sang out of tune, as, for instance, Sir Edwin Arnold, who was compelled to make 1884 his apogee in industrial matters.

In a debate in the House of Commons some time ago, Joseph Chamberlain said:

"I regard many of our colonies as being in the condition of undeveloped estates, which can never be developed without imperial assistance. I shall be prepared to consider very carefully myself, and then if I am satisfied, to confidently submit to the House any case which may occur in which, by the judicious investment of British money, these estates which belong to the British crown may be developed for the benefit of their population and for the benefit of the greater population which is outside."

This declaration was generally accepted as foreshadowing the abandonment of the principles of Cobdenism, but it evoked only a feeble protest from free-traders. It would have taken the British public by storm if sober second thought had not brought to mind the fact that English colonists have constantly moving within them the perverse desire to build up manufactures in their own land, and have manifested a readiness to do so even though the mother country suffer a loss of trade in consequence.

The contemplation of this peculiarity suggests that the promised benefits of an imperial zollverein may be illusory. If Englishmen could persuade themselves that imperial federation offered the advantages its advocates say it does, free trade would be abandoned at once. But even though English ports may be kept open, and the goods of the foreigner allowed to pass through them freely, no candid person will dissent from the conclusion that the spirit of Cobdenism, which was a jumble of false economic ideas, prompted by selfish desires and masquerading under the garb of "Peace and good will to all men," is almost extinct in England. Lecky candidly admits that educated Englishmen now recognize that Cobdenism was devised in the "interest of a great commercial country which did not produce sufficient food for its own subsistence, although its manufactures

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

might almost supply the world," and he adds "that because the rest of the world could not be deluded into believing that a policy designed to secure the commercial supremacy of England, by making the people of other nations dependent upon her for manufactured articles, it was foredoomed to failure." The prosperity enjoyed by England, because it was ready to take advantage of the great impulse given to trade by the gold discoveries, averted this doom for a long time by obscuring the real workings of Cobdenism; but now that it is plainly seen that every advanced nation is determined to maintain its own workshops, the English have lost heart, and, economically speaking, Great Britain is drifting no one can tell whither.

JOHN P. YOUNG.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FRANCES ELIZABETH WILLARD.

BY LADY HENRY SOMERSET, ACTING PRESIDENT OF THE WORLD'S WOMAN'S CHRISTIAN TEMPERANCE UNION.

IT is difficult sometimes to gauge, as we turn the pages of current history, what are the events and which are the lives that are making an indelible mark on our day. Only from time to time when some crisis arrests our thought do we begin to disentangle from the multitude of current events those salient features that stand out as special landmarks. I believe that when the record of the nineteenth century is read by those who can form truer estimates because distance will give a juster sense of proportion, the name of the woman who has just passed out from her field of work in this world will remain as one of those who moulded the history of our time not only in America, but throughout the world. There is no other life to-day that could be so widely mourned, except the Queen of England, and the grief that will come to thousands of hearts when she has left us will be one less personal in character than the bereavement that has fallen upon tens of thousands of men and women all the world over. When the news of Frances Willard's death was announced in the great city of London, no other name coming to us across the Atlantic would have been so widely known or so dearly loved. English newspapers are not as a rule enthusiastic, more especially about celebrities of other nationalities; but there has not been one single paper that has not recorded in its columns the life work of Frances Willard and the irreparable gap that she has left in the ranks of philanthropists.

It should be the pride of America that no other country could have produced her and no other age understood her, but it will be for future generations to realize what her life has meant

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to humanity. It is not because Frances Willard toiled for twenty years in the temperance cause that she is famous, not because she gathered round her an association of women more fully organized and with probably a stronger *esprit de corps* than any other woman's society in the world; but rather because she was a woman who saw ahead of her time, who realized that the evils that were round her must be grappled with by an entirely new conception of woman's responsibility to the world. She has discovered that legislative results were not worth the paper they were written on unless the same moral forces that had succeeded in obtaining them had also a voice in choosing the executive that was to carry them into effect. She realized that the religious feeling of a country was of little use unless it permeated its whole executive life, and that the divorce that has existed so long between the Church, in the widest, truest sense of the word, the government of nations and the framing of the laws, was wholly disastrous to the best interests of any people. In order to endeavor to educate the coming race she did not set about a system of reform that meant a sweeping down of all existing barriers, a destruction of all that is, in order to make room for that which was to be; but she realized that, to effect great reforms, it is the home circle that must be first touched with a deep sense of responsibility for that wider circle beyond, which we call the nation. "God in government" was the motto of all the public work she did. The Sermon on the Mount was to her the Christian decalogue by which the world was to be governed, and if she was visionary and idealistic she resembled in this only the great Founder of Christianity, who has set the highest before us in order that we might ever strive after the noblest and the best.

It is a pride to us in England to know that Frances Willard's ancestors were brave yeomen of the county of Kent; and in the little village church of Horsmonden, amid the green fields and the hop gardens of that sunny spot, are still to be seen the records in crabbed handwriting on yellow parchment of the Willard family, before they left the mother-land to seek "a church without a bishop and a state without a king."

The early training of the girl who was destined to do so great a work is perhaps accountable for much of the freshness and originality which marked her in after life. Born in the State of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

New York, when still quite a child her father and mother moved to a farm in Wisconsin, where they lived from her seventh to her nineteenth year; and there, surrounded by broad, rolling plains and streams and forests, the child grew among the birds and the flowers, and the memories of that happy childhood remained fresh and bright with her through after years of toil and the saddening influences that must surround a reformer's life. It was my good fortune to meet Mrs. Willard during the first visit I paid to America, and I have seldom been so impressed by the dignity of any woman. It would have been impossible in her presence to say an irreverent word of anyone, for humanity to her was sacred; and she seemed to live with such high ideals that to her the spirit of Emerson's words was an ever-present reality:

> "Oh make me beautiful within,
> And may mine eyes the good behold
> In everything save sin."

I fully realized the influence that this mother must have had upon her daughter, and Miss Willard has often told me of the unsparing pains that she gave to her children's education, the careful training, the refining influence, and the enthusiasm for right which she constantly brought to bear upon the children whom she loved so well. The early education that Frances Willard received was one that had been well thought out: the best English poetry, the biographies of great men, the classics of history and of religion formed the library which the eager spirit constantly devoured. All novels, however, were excluded, and it was not until in early girlhood she went to spend a few days with a friend that to Frances was opened a new world in the perusal of *Jane Eyre, Shirley* and *Villette*. "I read them all in feverish haste," she said, "closing with *Villette*, in the midst of which I was on a lovely summer evening just before twilight, when a long shadow fell across the threshold where I was sitting and unconscious of everything about me, my father's tall form bent over me. He took the book from my hand, and as he saw the flush on my cheeks his brow was clouded. 'Never let my daughter see that book again, please, Madam,' he said to the lady of the house, who not knowing his rules had hardly noted my proceedings. The book was taken from me, and to this day I have never finished reading *Villette*."

Of the happy, holy days spent in that free country life Miss

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Willard has spoken constantly, and I have rarely heard her address any large audience without in some way reverting to those blessed times of childhood which gave her an enthusiasm for nature and a deep understanding of the meaning of joy. The love of an outdoor life remained with her even though she had to sacrifice her inclinations (as indeed she sacrificed them continually) on the altar of her work; but as I write I can see her now two years ago in the pleasant lanes on the sea's coast of Norfolk, and I can hear her saying, as we sat under the sweet, cool hedges, how beautiful the world was, and as she softly stroked the little flowers she would continually repeat, "Earth with her thousand voices praises God." Miss Willard's early career is too well known in America to make it necessary for me to reiterate it in this slight sketch. Her early life was given to teaching, beginning with a public school on an Illinois prairie and ending as president of the Woman's College at Evanston and professor in the University.

In 1862 came the first break in the home circle, when her sister Mary was called home; and she has given the simple, touching details of this gentle life in her charming book entitled *Nineteen Beautiful Years.* Her sister's last words to her were the inspiration of her life. "Tell everybody to be good;" and surely no message was more faithfully carried out, for it has been the life work of the one who was left for a while, and who has now joined the home circle in the Land of Light. In 1874 Miss Willard resigned her office as Dean of the Woman's College, and, as she says of this period, "made the greatest sacrifice her life had known or ever can know." She describes in her journal how, although overwhelmed with grief at the thought of leaving the work she loved so well, she had been forced to send in her resignation because she could not but be true to her principles. The last night before she laid down her duties, in an agony of tears she pitied herself as many a young spirit had done before. She says: "I tried so hard and meant so well. At last everything grew still and sweet and holy, while far into the night the deep June sky bent over me with a beauty that was akin to tenderness. The storm of my soul ebbed away slowly and the sobs ceased; as dies the wave along the shore, so died away for evermore my sorrow to lose the beautiful college that my heart had loved as other women's hearts love their sweet and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sacred homes. In the long hours that followed, the peace that passeth understanding settled down upon my soul. God was revealed to me as a great brooding Motherly Spirit, and all of us who tried to carry on the University while He carried on the Universe seemed like little boys and girls who meant well but who didn't always understand each other. The figure was of children playing in a nursery, and one little boy had more vigor than the rest of us, and naturally wanted us to play his way, while a little girl whom I thought I could identify said, 'No, my way is best!' Then a deep voice declared, 'This is the interpretation—good to forgive, best to forget.' And then the happiness that mocketh speech flowed, like the blessed tranquil river of dear old Forest Home, all through my soul, and overflowed its banks with quiet, happy tears."

In 1873-4 there had swept over America an inspiration for temperance work which has since been known as the Woman's Crusade. While still Dean of the College, Miss Willard had felt the enthusiasm of this movement, and when she resigned the presidency she threw herself heart and soul into the crusade. In vain her wise counsellors pointed out to her that, as she was dependent upon her own exertions for her current needs and temperance work pays least of all work, therefore she could not afford to take it up; that she had made for herself a successful field in higher education, and that it was simply madness for her to throw away her gifts upon a cause to which neither fame nor money was attached. Her heart had gone out after the movement; in her ears rang the old home songs which sounded so strangely in the bars of the saloons. The pathos of the women's prayers had found an echo in her soul; the baptism of a great call was upon her, and she determined to throw in her lot with the band of reformers. And so her life changed and instead of peace, she says, "I was to participate in war; instead of the sweetness of home I was to become a wanderer on the face of the earth; instead of a student in libraries, I was to frequent public halls and railway cars; instead of the company of scholarly and cultured men I was to see the dregs of the saloon, the gambling house and haunt of shame. Hence I have felt that great promotion came to me when I was counted worthy to be a worker in the organized crusade for God and Home and Every Land."

The opening way was not an easy one; it was filled with hard-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ship and privation, but all seemed trivial to the eager spirit who desired only to suffer something worthy of a disciple for humanity's sweet sake. Speaking of this time in her life later, she says: "I have never known a more lovely period. I dwelt in the spirit; the world had nothing to give and nothing to take away." Miss Willard realized, however, that her mother was dependent upon her exertions, and it was therefore necessary that her work should be in some way remunerated, and consequently she accepted the post of Corresponding Secretary for the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and shortly afterward was appointed president of the society, a work which she carried on until her death. And what has this work meant? Unceasing toil for twenty years. Only by those who have shared her labor was her power of work fully realized; the long days of writing on the cars, the immense audiences to meet at night, the endless journeys resumed the next day, the women to interview, the details to arrange, the hands to shake, the difficulties to smooth away, the disputes to settle—it was one unceasing round of arduous toil; and yet I have never heard her murmur, never known her discontented; but the sweet, bright, cheery spirit forged ahead doing what there was to hand, meeting the heaviness of it all with a buoyancy born of indomitable optimism and untiring faith in humanity. The impression produced upon my mind when I first heard Frances Willard address one of the annual conventions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union in 1891 will never be effaced. The charm of her speech, like her own character, consisted in its many sidedness, its eloquence, its pathos, its humor and above all its humanness, its complete understanding of the lives and necessities of others. She was as some master musician who is able to sweep all chords and yet continually recur to a melody tender and restful and sweet. She was so womanly in her strength, so joyous in her earnestness, and withal so supremely spiritual, that she seemed at all times as one who dwelt apart, and indeed to most of us who mourn her to-day, the words that have been constantly on our lips are these: "We shall not see her like again." It is unnecessary for me to dwell upon the breadth of the work that she has accomplished. She has done far more than build a vast temperance organization the world over. It is true that her conception has bound the women of all lands in one great society; that her enthusiasm has fired missionaries to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

start out round the world carrying with them their gospel of a pure life and a protected home; that hundreds of men and women are to-day engaged in philanthropic work who never realized their responsibility until they met her; that armies of children are enlisted in the great league for reform who will grow up to be the home guard of America's best interests: but she did more than all this—she taught the world that woman loses none of her best attributes, her gentlest influence, her strongest hold upon the affections of husband or children, neglects none of the sweet home ways, because she realizes that life holds for her responsibilities to humanity which she dare not ignore.

The essential spirit of the teaching of Frances Willard breathed in almost the last words she ever spoke before she crossed the dark river that separates us from the world of life. Her dear and constant companion, Anna Gordon, had been singing to her the old home hymn she loved so well,

"Gently, Lord, oh gently lead us,"

and when she came to the words, "If I awake among the blest," she turned to her and said, "No, Anna, not 'I,' don't sing it 'I'; sing 'we'; Christianity is 'we,' not 'I'; it is our Father. Christianity is 'we.'" That was the keynote of her life. "I can have no happiness when others sorrow and I could help to make them glad; I can have no joy when little children are ignorant of a child's heritage of joy. I cannot sit at ease while other lives are held in the clasp of sin and souls are bowed in agony of shame. It is *our* Father, for He loves them all, and in Him I love them too." It was this spirit that sent her forth upon her mission; it was in this spirit that she worked in failing health and the constant weariness of growing weakness until "she laid down her life for her brethren."

We do not forget in England that to no other philanthropist did we ever give so warm a welcome. The great meeting at Exeter Hall that was held in her honor was probably the most representative gathering that has ever assembled to greet any great man or woman on that historic platform; and we are glad to know that we laid laurels at her feet while yet the homage could bring a smile to her face and the words of praise could still rejoice her heart. And now she has gone, and to us she has left her legacy of work—work that we dare not neglect, for still we know that "Eyes do regard us in Eternity's stillness," and we have

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

learned our lesson from that womanly spirit whose words of sweet reasonableness have been spoken so often, whose many-sided arguments and loving pleas we will yet prove have not been "love's labor lost." Such lives are never ended, for their spirit lives on in the lives of others. Frances Willard felt that a woman owed it to all other women to live as bravely, as helpfully, and as grandly as she could.

There is an old plantation melody, the refrain of which runs:

> "Maybe the Lord will be glad of me,
> Maybe the Lord will be glad of me,
> In Heaven He'll rejoice,"

and the words and the music, she says, "touched a chord very far down in my heart, and I have hummed the strange old snatch of pathos to myself times without number at twilight on the cars after a hard day's work with book and pen." And who can doubt that He who has sent some "apostles, some prophets," was glad of her who has been a ministering spirit to the needs of many. "If the story of my life," she has said, "has any force at all, I pray that it may help to hasten the coming of Christ's Kingdom, whose visible token is universal brotherhood; the blessed time drawing nearer to us every day, when in the most practical sense and by the very constitution of society and government, all men's weal shall be each man's care."

ISABEL SOMERSET.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE GREAT LAKES AND THE MODERN NAVY.

BY LIEUT. J. H. GIBBONS, U. S. N.

THE report of the Commissioner of Navigation for 1897 contains the following statement: "The Great Lakes region, for the first time in our history, has built more tonnage than all the rest of the country. One hundred and twenty vessels of 116,937 tons, compared with 137 vessels of 115,296 tons for the rest of the United States." This statement is fraught with interest to those who are watching the progress of our merchant marine; and as this progress is intimately associated with the growth of the navy, it becomes an important question how far this industrial movement on the Great Lakes may be made an important factor in our naval policy.

The coast lines of the Great Lakes border upon nine States containing more than one-third of our population. The six large cities on this coast line will easily aggregate a population of three millions, and to this must be added hundreds of prosperous towns. Until within a few years agricultural products and lumber were the principal freights in the lake carrying traffic, but the recent discoveries of iron ore in the Lake Superior region have brought about an unparalleled commercial and maritime growth. This latter industry must necessarily prove far-reaching in its effects; for we are living in the age of steel, and whatever tends to place us abreast of our rivals in the production of steel tends at the same time to increase our prosperity, and to make us great among the nations of the earth.

Turning to the particular branch of the steel industry that is of the most importance to the navy, viz., ship building, a brief historical retrospect will show that, after years of exclusion, everything points to our again entering the contest for commercial supremacy on the ocean. In the transitory period from

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wood to metal in ship construction, a period roughly estimated as extending from 1840 to 1880, the American flag practically disappeared from the high seas, while England, who had held for over two hundred years the first place as a ship-building and ship-owning power, still maintained her position. Finding her home supply of ship timber exhausted, she began to import it, and as this was necessarily incompatible with the maintenance of her supremacy, the next step was to take advantage of her increasing production of metals. The evolution of the iron ship and its successor, the steel ship, was the result. The last thirty-five years have witnessed the production of the English steam fleet, until now British steamers carry the freight and passengers of the greater part of the world. The British shipyards, too, can now undertake the construction of at least twenty battle-ships and more than twice this number of cruisers at the same time, a potential strength that adds immensely to the maintenance of her present sea power.

But England will in time be confronted with a new difficulty. The ores in that country are not suitable for steel making, and for some years past large quantities of ore have been imported from mines in the northern part of Spain. These mines are being rapidly exhausted. Four-fifths of the output goes to England, and it has been estimated that at the present rate ten years will exhaust the mines of the Biscay region. Of course there are other sources of supply, Sweden, for example; but they are not easily accessible, and cheapness of transportation is essential. The condition of affairs promises, therefore, to be very much the same, so far as materials go, as it was at that period when England passed from the use of wood to that of metal in building ships.

Let us now look at the condition of the steel industry in the United States. In 1892 there were put out 16,036,043 tons of iron ore, of which the Lake Superior region contributed 9,564,388 tons. The ore from the Great Lakes surpasses in richness the ores from any other part of the country. New discoveries are being constantly reported, and the deposits are so easily accessible as to make it possible to supply any demand. During the past ten years there has been an enormous development in this new industry in the Lake Superior region, until now the amount of capital invested in mining and transportation is esti-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mated at $234,000,000. The rapid growth of this industry justifies the prediction that with access to the ocean by a practicable deep-water way we can not only balance our domestic iron and steel trade, but also compete in the foreign market. At present many iron and steel plants on the seaboard import foreign iron ores, as the low value of iron ore in proportion to its weight shuts out transportation by rail from the West. But with a deep water canal reaching from the Great Lakes to the ocean, the ores required by the manufacturers on the Atlantic seaboard could be supplied more cheaply than the foreign ores, thus increasing the field for capital and industry, while at the same time the iron and steel of the establishments on the Great Lakes could be shipped through by water without breaking bulk and seek the markets of the world.

This brings us to the subject of deep-water canals. For several years, while the national government has been busy with the projected Nicaraguan Canal, the people of the West, through private endeavor and public discussion, have been agitating the question of deep waterways from the Great Lakes to the seaboard. The International Deep Waterways Convention held a meeting at Cleveland, Ohio, September 24, 1895, and among the delegates were business men, capitalists, and civil engineers from the Lake States, and also from the Dominion of Canada. Through the efforts of this association the matter was brought before Congress by Senator William Vilas, of Wisconsin, who, on February 8, 1895, introduced a joint resolution authorizing a preliminary inquiry concerning deep waterways between the ocean and the Great Lakes. This resolution was incorporated in the Sundry Civil Appropriation Bill, and became a law on March 2, 1895. On November 4 the President, in conformity with its provisions, appointed three commissioners, James B. Angell, of Michigan, John E. Russell, of Massachusetts, and Lyman E. Cooley, of Illinois. Soon after this, the Dominion of Canada appointed a similar commission, and a joint meeting was held in January, 1896. The United States commission spent a year in thoroughly investigating the canal question, and submitted their report to the President January 8, 1897. In his letter transmitting the report to Congress, President Cleveland says:

"The advantages of a direct and unbroken water transportation of the products of our Western States and Territories from a convenient point of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

shipment to our seaboard ports are plainly palpable. The report of the commissioners contains, in my opinion, a demonstration of the feasibility of securing such transportation, and gives ground for the anticipation that better and more uninterrupted commerce, through the plan suggested, between the Great West and foreign ports, with the increase of national prosperity which must follow in its train, will not long escape American enterprise and activity."

Meanwhile American "enterprise and activity" have been giving the world an object lesson in canal building. The Chicago Drainage Canal designed primarily to furnish an adequate system of drainage for the city of Chicago, but containing all the features of a ship canal, is a municipal undertaking that is particularly valuable in showing the immense improvement in excavating machines and the resultant low cost of canal building. The main drainage channel extends from the west fork of the south branch of the Chicago River southwest to Lockport, a distance of about 29 miles. The width at the top is from 162 feet to 300 feet, and at the bottom from 160 feet to 200 feet. The depth of water varies from 23 feet to 26 feet. According to present estimates, it will cost $27,303,216. A statement has been made that the work of excavation will be carried out for less than half the cost of similar work on the Manchester ship canal, the dimensions of which are, length, 30½ miles; width at top, 172 feet; width at bottom, 120 feet; depth, 26 feet.

President Cleveland's prediction, therefore, that the feasibility of deep water transportation from the Great Lakes to the ocean will not long escape American enterprise, bids fair to be realized. If the City of Chicago can demonstrate practically that deep water canal building has been brought within the bounds of reasonable cost, the general government must, in response to urgent appeals from a large section of the country interested, soon pass beyond the stage of preliminary investigation to that of definite action. Thus far the question of cost has not been thoroughly dealt with, but valuable data have been collected. Among the more important conclusions reached by the United States Deep Waterways Commission are the following:

1. That it is entirely feasible to construct such canals and develop such channels as will give 28 feet of water from the Great Lakes to the seaboard.

2. That, starting from the heads of Lakes Michigan and Su-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

perior, the most eligible route is through the several Great Lakes and their intermediate channels and the proposed Niagara Ship Canal (Tonawanda to Olcott) to Lake Ontario. From Lake Ontario the Canadian seaboard can be reached by the way of the St. Lawrence River, while the American seaboard can be reached by way of the St. Lawrence River, Lake Champlain, and the Hudson River, or by way of the Oswego-Oneida-Mohawk Valley route and the Hudson River.

3. That while our policy of canal building should contemplate the ultimate development of the largest useful capacity, and all work should be planned on that basis, at the same time it is practicable to develop the work in separate sections, each step having its economic justification. The Niagara Ship Canal should first be undertaken, and incidentally the broadening and deepening of the intermediate channels of the lakes.

Such then is a brief résumé of this important industrial movement and its collateral engineering undertakings. From a military point of view, a series of canals entirely within the limits of the United States could be more readily defended. But the advantages of following, as far as possible, the natural waterways will at first probably outweigh the question of defense. If the lake coast line of over 3,000 miles is brought into deep-water connection with the Atlantic seaboard, its permanent defense will be a question for the Army. On the other hand, if permanent arbitration is to be depended upon as a warrant for following natural commercial routes without any thought of ultimate defense, the international character of parts of the work and the riparian interests involved will make the readjustment of the existing treaty relations a question for our statesmen.

Coming now to the direct interests of the Navy in this politico-economic question, it will be found that under existing conditions there is little hope of any immediate addition from this new source to our war vessel tonnage. The Rush-Bagot Convention of 1817, entered into by the United States and Great Britain, provides that the naval forces to be maintained on the Great Lakes shall be confined on each side to one vessel on Lake Ontario, one vessel on Lake Champlain and two vessels on the Upper Lakes. These vessels are limited to one hundred tons burden and an armament of one eighteen-pounder cannon each. This treaty has not taken the shape of a formal international

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

treaty, but has been practically accepted as binding by both countries for a period of three-quarters of a century. Its stipulations have twice during its history been notably disregarded, once by each country, but only on occasions of serious public emergency. In view of the great progress made in ship building and marine engineering, it is not strange that there has been an evasion of the spirit of these antique stipulations, if not a direct violation of the letter of the law. The U. S. S. "Michigan," now in service on the Upper Lakes, is of 685 tons displacement, has a main battery of four six-pounder guns. In the building up of the New Navy, some of the ship builders on the Great Lakes, whose energy and enterprise had gone so far as to build whale-backs that were towed through the canals in sections and put together at Montreal, began to inquire whether these methods would not be extended to war vessels. In 1890 F. W. Wheeler & Company, of West Bay City, Michigan, were the lowest bidders for the construction of an armored cruiser, one protected cruiser, and a practice ship. In 1895, the Detroit Dry Dock Company proposed the construction of parts of vessels of war. Both of these bids were rejected by the Navy Department as being in violation of the Rush-Bagot agreement. The clause of the agreement which was adjudged to prohibit such construction is as follows: "All other armored vessels (besides those authorized to be retained) on these lakes shall be forthwith dismantled, *and no other vessels of war shall be there built or armed.*" On account of this decision, the activity in ship building for government purposes has been confined, on the Great Lakes, to revenue cutters and light ships. The Mississippi Valley, unhampered by these restrictions, has built one torpedo-boat, the "Ericsson."

Although vessels of war cannot be built on the Great Lakes, the building there of merchant vessels that by means of the projected canals will be able to reach the seaboard will have an indirect bearing on the future of the navy. Captain Mahan and other writers have pointed out that we have practically reversed the natural order of things in building vessels of war before building up the merchant marine. For more than twenty years the government has been a steady customer of the ship builders on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts. As a result ship building plants have been improved, workmen have been trained, and contributory industries have been developed. But it is claimed by these

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

builders that the patronage of the government is a temporary help only and that the demands of our coastwise trade are insufficient to promote ship building on a large scale. The main demand for ships must be created by an extensive foreign trade carried on in American bottoms. It has been demonstrated that the economic changes which will be brought about by a deep-water route from the Great Lakes to the seaboard will enable us to compete with England in the ocean-carrying trade. Since the Civil War all our energies have been directed toward purely domestic development, and capital has sought investments in the extension of railways, the settlement of new territory, and the industrial regeneration of the South. The events of the past few years force us to look beyond the limits of our own shores, and our diplomacy has made the Monroe doctrine something more than a rhetorical declaration. If we boldly aspire to commercial and political supremacy in the western hemisphere, and to the creation of a foreign carrying trade, we must admit the absolute necessity for a steadily increasing navy.

The canal-builders and the shipbuilders of the Great Lakes have shown that, if they are accorded the proper encouragement by the national government, the country may rest satisfied with its resources for establishing a foreign commerce carried in domestic bottoms and to provide naval war material to protect it. Behind these industrial leaders stand, as has been said before, more than one-third of the entire population of the United States. Nothing can be more gratifying to the navy than the growth of a sentiment favorable to it in a region that a few years ago was most apathetic. To-day the citizens of the middle West show a lively interest in naval affairs, and are taking a prominent part in naval militia work. Chicago, Saginaw, Detroit, Toledo, Cleveland, and Rochester have large, flourishing naval militia organizations. The Detroit organization recently took the old "Yantic" from Montreal to Detroit without either State or national aid. In Rochester the boat reconnoissance work on Lake Ontario performed by the local organization has received well-merited praise from the War College. These are only two instances, but they show the existence of a patriotic spirit that ought to be fostered and directed to the proper ends. Here is a new field for recruiting the naval *personnel*.

There is a vague idea among many naval officers that we

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

really possess a strong naval reserve in our seafaring population. Careful investigation will prove that this is not a fact. In the merchant marine and deep-sea fisheries from 50 per cent. to 70 per cent. of the men are foreigners, and the number of men available, even if they all enlisted, which of course would be impossible, would not serve to put the navy on a war footing. The Naval War College has been investigating the various phases that war on our coast might assume, and has found that we shall need a great number of officers, in addition to those of the regular navy. Where are these additional officers to come from? The sources from which they were obtained in 1861 no longer exist, for our deep-sea merchant shipping has practically disappeared. Captain Taylor, of the War College, has given the following brief summary of the present condition of affairs:

"... The same conditions do not exist now as did during the Rebellion. That war, especially on the part of the navy, was offensive and attacked an enemy upon its own coast, and required a large number of deep-sea ships and deep-sea officers.

"The wars for which we must plan, at least for the next few years, are defensive for our part, and to be waged against enemies probably superior to us on the sea. This throws upon us as a principal *role* the defence of our coast and the supplementing of our small seagoing navy by a formidable flotilla of small craft, which, when thoroughly organized and drilled, shall dominate our channels, sounds, and bays, and make their comfortable or permanent occupation by hostile fleets an impossibility."

Our small sea-going navy is now manifestly undermanned. As additions are made to its *material* the deficiency in *personnel* is partly made up by stop-gap legislation—always an unsatisfactory process. As a business proposition there has been among our legislators a desire to build up an adequate navy, but as a purely naval undertaking there has always been opposition to providing the necessary *personnel*. England is now going through an interesting experience, of which we may well take heed. For the past ten years the naval policy of that country has tended towards maintaining in time of peace a *personnel* that is practically on a war footing. The objection to this policy has been that it involves an immense expenditure in pay, provisions, and pensions, besides the maintenance of ships to give the necessary instruction at sea. The alternative has been to develop the efficiency of the Naval Reserve. But here the supporters of such a plan have met with the same difficulties that beset us, *i. e.* the merchant marine, which ought to be the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

chief source of supply of the Naval Reserve, is becoming honeycombed with foreigners. Reliable calculations show that the number of foreigners in British ships has increased $22\frac{3}{10}$ per cent. in eight years. Poor wages and the natural discomforts of sea life have caused men of British birth to seek employment as skilled workers ashore.

But the United States has one advantage over England. The latter, in inspecting the source of supply for the Naval Reserve, has turned to her widely scattered colonies, and reasonably expects that in time of war they will contribute their share of men. The United States has no colonies, but its peculiar system of federal government permits it to rely, in a measure, upon the States to organize and maintain volunteers for national defence, although until recently the system has been applied almost exclusively to recruiting the land forces. Ten years ago an unsuccessful attempt was made in Congress to create a naval reserve of officers and men from the merchant marine. Several States bordering upon the seacoast then made the matter a local issue, and what were called "naval battalions to be attached to the volunteer militia" was the result. With the Great Lakes brought into deep-water communication with the Mississippi and the Atlantic seaboard a cordon of coast line States will be formed whose similarity of interests will greatly increase the source from which the country can draw for that second line of defence required in time of war to "dominate our channels, sounds, and bays." Barred by the Rocky Mountains, the Pacific coast stands apart from any immediate benefits from interior water-way improvements, but the building of an isthmian canal will bring into closer relations with the other maritime States kindred interests that have already produced such excellent shipbuilders and such skilled seamen.

To those who doubt the possibility of recruiting inland men for general service in the navy, and who question the ultimate efficiency of the men thus recruited, it is only necessary to point out that last summer the Bureau of Navigation established recruiting stations on the Great Lakes, during the busiest part of the navigation season, and from more than five hundred applications enlisted three hundred men — seamen and mechanics. These men, according to the reports from the officers of ships to which they have been assigned, are all of very high standard.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

They are self-respecting Americans. This in itself is a great gain. After recruiting the general service to three-quarters of its full war strength, which can be done as occasion demands, by the enlistment of seamen and mechanics, and by fostering the apprentice system, a naval reserve will have to be depended upon to supply the remaining fourth, and to make up the wastage of war. This is the English estimate, and it is apparently sound. Until the national government takes up the naval reserve question the business and professional men who, combining a patriotic spirit with aquatic tastes, enlist in the naval militia, will be very valuable aids in examining into and keeping informed concerning the seafaring *personnel* of their States. The energy and executive ability of the men that have taken hold of this movement in the West (many of them graduates of the Naval Academy) can be depended upon in case of sudden need to enroll a very desirable set of men, and thus relieve the regular navy of preliminary work which its scarcity of regular officers would otherwise make a very difficult undertaking.

One word more about our seafaring population. Recent investigation by the War College has developed the fact that during the Civil War a large number of men—fishermen and local water men—along the North Atlantic coast did not enlist for service in the regular navy. The long term of enlistment required, coupled with the fact that the sea had no novelty for them, may have blunted their patriotism. An inquiry among their successors confirms the opinion that they would much prefer to be utilized for local defence. Torpedo-boat flotillas, mosquito fleets, coast signal-stations, and submarine mining squads would therefore be able to obtain among this class very valuable recruits, while the cruising navy, especially with its term of enlistment extended, as has frequently been recommended, from three to four years, would not succeed in attracting them.

The foregoing propositions and the conclusions to be drawn from them may be briefly summarized as follows :

1. The Great Lakes region has developed the iron and steel industry to a degree that enables it to surpass all the rest of the United States in the important industry of shipbuilding.

2. The improvements in canal building make it only a question of time when this region will have a deep-water outlet to the sea.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

3. The result of this deep-water way will be the rehabilitation of our merchant marine and the creation of an extensive foreign trade carried in American bottoms.

4. The expansion of our merchant marine will be followed necessarily by the expansion of the navy.

5. The Great Lakes region is debarred by existing treaty relations from contributing *material* for naval warfare, but, containing as it does more than one-third of our entire population, the navy should, as a peace precaution, give immediate encouragement to the naval-militia movement in that part of the United States, thus developing a source of supply for the large increase in our *personnel* that war will render necessary.

The names of Perry and Chauncey remind us that Lake Erie and Lake Ontario were once the scene of important naval battles. In the hurried preparations of those days, when officers and men were brought from the seaboard over rough trails to improvise and man flotillas on the Lakes, the frontiersman stood ready with his rifle to aid the sailor. To-day, when the brig has given place to the battleship, and the 32-pounder to the 13-inch gun, the descendants of these frontiersmen may be depended upon to furnish their quota of men that have the handiness of the seaman, the skill of the gunner, and the ingenuity of the artisan. The scene changes to the high seas, but in the ranks of the militia coast defenders will be found the same spirit that animated the volunteers at Put-in-Bay and Sackett's Harbor.

J. H. GIBBONS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

REASONS FOR INCREASING THE REGULAR ARMY.

BY LIEUT. GEORGE B. DUNCAN, U. S. A.

THE government of the United States under the Constitution is ideally democratic, guaranteeing to the States a republican form of government, establishing justice for all its citizens and assuring them protection in all places, insuring domestic tranquility, providing for the common defence, promoting the general welfare, and undertaking to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity. In the consideration of these obligations one comes to an examination of the ways and means of fulfilling them, and this paper has to deal with a branch of the provisions necessary for the common defence.

The colonial experience which immediately preceded the Revolutionary War had inculcated a distrust of any power which was remote from the people. The experience of that war not only intensified this feeling, but increased inherent self-reliance. With peace there was a return to the old-time vocations and allegiance to their States, under whose laws the people had enjoyed and now continued to enjoy rights of liberty, property, and a fair measure of prosperity. There was a lack of community between the people of the different States in business interests and in sentiment, except as they met upon the common ground of ideas developed by the Revolution and antecedent oppression. There were no means of communication except by sea from port to port, and by stage and horseback on inland routes. It took a courier a week to travel from Boston to Philadelphia; and in foreign correspondence, three months to get an answer to an inquiry from London. An illimitable expanse of territory extended toward the west to be opened for settlement and cultivation. This was about the status of affairs when the Arti-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cles of Confederation were proving a failure, and the establishment of a more perfect union became necessary.

In forming a constitution which would be acceptable to the States and people, and at the same time give stability to the new government, all conditions had to be taken into consideration. There would be a wonderful accession of power to this central government, and there must be an interdiction of ability to abuse this power to the oppression of the citizen or to the destruction of the rights of the States. The history of the world and their own experience had taught the colonists that the chief instrument of abuse and tyranny was a standing army. Besides, of what possible use would be an army in a country so cut off from the rest of the world; where every man would leave the plow and the workshop, if need be, to preserve the liberty which had been the reward of indomitable pluck and perseverance under the magnificent leadership of Washington? There were no near neighbors from whom to expect invasion; there was no desire of extended empire through conquest; a mighty ocean separated them from the turbulent atmosphere of European dissensions; the people were thrifty and peaceable; and they could see in a standing army only a threat to the liberty so dearly bought. Therefore the Constitution was almost prohibitory in touching the subject of a regular military establishment; and while it gave Congress the power "to raise and support armies," it added, "but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than two years." And the early Acts of Congress specifically stated that the small force then in existence was to furnish protection to settlers from Indian depredations. To the people, through the militia, it was left "to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrection, and repel invasions." Emphasis was given to this sentiment in the second amendment to the Constitution, which declares: "A well-regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed."

This view of the influence of a standing army was a tremendous stride in advance of the then accepted theories.

A narrow stretch of sparsely settled country with the Atlantic Ocean as a bulwark against the military force of Europe, the United States looked for prosperity to the peaceful pursuits of industry. All that was desired was an opportunity to develop our

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

principles, our industries, and our institutions. Thinking men early saw the destiny which would ultimately push us on to the Pacific and to the status of a great nation. The 3d of April, 1803, saw the French province of Louisiana added to our territory. The treaty with Spain of February 19, 1821, ratified the cession of Florida. Texas was admitted as a State on the 29th of December, 1845, and the resultant war with Mexico gave us the magnificent domain of California, and this was again added to by the Gadsden purchase of 1853. The Alaska purchase of 1868 brought us to our present extent of territory.

Adhering to the advice of Washington, the United States has ever held aloof from entanglement in European politics. As to wars, the respect due us as a nation warranted the attitude assumed with France from July, 1798, to September, 1800, and in the affair with Tripoli from June, 1801, to June, 1805; honor demanded war with England in 1812; the war with Mexico was but an incident in the onward march of the Union to dominant power upon this western hemisphere. The only foreign policy developed has been that of President Monroe in his message to Congress in December, 1823, entering a protest against European conquest on this continent, and asserting that here at least should flourish the democratic principles that rulers derive their powers from the consent of the ruled, and to this doctrine the recent action of President Cleveland has forever pledged us.

The growth of the Union during the years preceding the civil war was that of peaceful industries, protected by geographical position from the influences of European politics. But divergencies of sentiment regarding matters of internal policy arose, and State after State undertook to throw off federal authority. And in civil war the wisdom of having refused to keep a standing army was put to the greatest possible test. The national unity was saved by supreme effort and at a cost of nearly 300,000 lives and millions of money. Of course, this war could have been crushed in the beginning by an efficient regular army, but that would not have been conducive to a final settlement of the questions at issue. To have annihilated secession by regular soldiers would have been a tyrannical use of power backed by bayonets; it would have increased hatred and strife, and led to secret preparation for a renewal of the struggle.

The Union emerged from this convulsion with military

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

power the first in the world; hundreds of thousands of trained soldiers, returned to industrial occupations, were ready to respond to any national emergency. The spectacle of the disbandment of the armies of the civil war was the most perfect guarantee of the perpetuity of our institutions, a lesson to the world in advanced civilization and a tribute to the blessings of peace. And so, it is believed, the purposes of our democratic institutions were best served during the first hundred years from the Declaration of Independence by keeping a standing army no larger than was necessary for a protection of the frontier from Indian depredations, and to an enforcement of the laws especially authorized by the Constitution.

With the downfall of the Confederacy the Union entered more fully upon its existence as a nation. It could no longer be looked upon as a confederation of States to be disbanded at the will of its members. The dangers told by the immortal Washington had been encountered and swept into oblivion. Independence and equality for all men with supreme sovereignty in the central government was eternally settled. Since then our population has doubled.

The question now arises, What are the changed conditions which warrant the keeping of an increased standing army, and in what will such an army prove a source of national safety?

The cornerstone of the superstructure of opposition to a standing army has been our isolation. Are we still isolated?

The genius of invention has changed all the essential conditions of a few years ago. Time and space are being rapidly annihilated. The wind and waves of the ocean do not disturb the path of steam navigation. We read the events of the world's day at our breakfast table. A massacre in Armenia produces a heartache in America. The rise and fall of the money market in London finds its echo in New York. The fashions of our cities are the counterpart of those of Paris. Our citizens in the pursuit of pleasure, business, or science are to be found in every land. Our churches send their missionaries into every available spot. Commercial activity pays no attention to geographical boundaries, and the product of American manufactories is found in every market. So that in our feelings, our information, our pleasures, and our business interests we are not isolated. At the same time, foreign capital owns or controls a very large portion of our busi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ness interests. We are being continually brought into closer contact with other nations, and will ultimately be called into the deliberations of the world.

Now look at the matter from a geographical standpoint. Distance can only be measured by time, and in this light no nation is widely separated from another. The ocean is but a highway of travel and commerce, with a time-table about as accurate as those of our trans-continental railroads. The world grows smaller and nations formerly but little known to each other now rub elbows in the march of civilization.

From a military point of view England could transport her troops to Canada much more easily and in less time than it took to put Sir John Moore's army in the Peninsula, and with as little expense as was required to furnish supplies to Wellington in Spain; and could wage war against us with greater ease than against Germany or Russia or France. Speaking broadly, our Atlantic seaboard is within a fortnight's reach of the armed camps of Europe. Upon the West, the rise of Japan to military and naval power, with the thrill of recent victory in her people, gives us a nation ready to measure her strength with ours whenever occasion in conflicting interest presents itself.

In touching the relation of the United States to the other powers, it can be laid down as a fixed rule that there are no means of preventing strife between nations; and that the more fully our people enter into the affairs of the world, the greater is the possibility of friction with other people. The Congress of Paris in 1856 adopted the strongest possible recommendations that nations would, before appealing to arms, have recourse to the good offices of friendly powers to settle their grievances. But of what avail has that action been? Since then the most destructive wars have been waged that the world has ever known, and the most quickly carried to their legitimate conclusion. And the art and science of war has steadily kept pace in improvements with the inventions of peaceful industries.

In the face of these facts, and as the exponents of a democracy which in the end will regenerate the political system of the world, our military policy, as outlined by Secretary of War Lamont, of acting in war upon the defensive "until the great armies which exist in embryo in our free citizenship can be enrolled, organized, and put into the field," is hardly abreast of ex-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

isting conditions or conformable to the self-respect and dignity of a great nation, which should possess the ability to punish transgression as well as to protect its institutions. An offensive war might become necessary to obtain satisfaction for a breach of treaty, or an insult to the flag, or to an ambassador, or to our honor, or, above all, to protect the individual citizen against foreign violence; and any of these incidents is much more liable to occur than is a war of defence to protect our national sovereignity and independence. A known preparedness to send an efficient military force wherever the exigencies of just war might demand would be the safest guarantee against such a possibility. The folly of a populous nation trying to organize its army after the outbreak of war was recently illustrated in the case of China.

The object of war has been thus defined by the ablest American soldier of to-day, "to conquer an honorable, advantageous, and lasting peace." To secure these blessings it is proper that every citizen should be willing to leave his vocation and take up arms in support of the nation's right, and there is no question that in time of national danger there would be more men than equipment for battle. But the old idea that a uniform makes a soldier must be abandoned. Success in future wars will depend upon skill in the use of weapons and in fire discipline, combined with implicit obedience to and trust in commanders. These cannot become second nature, as they must to be effective, through the training of volunteer camps in the days or weeks preceding a conflict. The Union has progressed to that point when it can best be served, so far as the objects of war are concerned, by a regular army, such a force as, at least, would serve for the first line of attack. The old bugbear of a standing army being a menace to liberty should have been effaced with the settlement of the question of State sovereignty. It should never be forgotten that a soldier is a citizen in the fullest acceptance of the word; his life and training keep alive his patriotism; in his independence of party or sectarian influence his mind, perhaps, grasps more fully the meaning of democracy; his influence is non-partisan in all controversies, and his life stands between his country's flag and dishonor. What else can there be but insurance to property, life, and happiness to the body politic in the maintenance of a well-disciplined army of liberty-loving, and patriotic citizens?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Now consider the place occupied by the Union in international affairs. In sovereignty, independence, and equality all nations stand upon the same level in their relation to each other. Comity brings them into friendly commerce, its requirements being regard for the reputation of other states, respect to foreign flags upon the sea, courtesy in diplomatic intercourse, polite treatment of rulers or representatives of other countries, and the right of redress for injury or wrong to a subject by foreign aggression. Treaties usually define the relations between nations.

According to the possession of power to excite the respectful attention of other governments in the domain of international affairs, nations are divided into classes. This power depends upon their military and naval preparations for war, with further regard to their resources and ability to carry on a conflict. There are usually reckoned six first-class powers in Europe: Russia, France, England, Germany, Austria and Italy; one, Japan, in Asia; and one, the United States, in America. The future may confidently look to these nations as shaping the destiny of the world. In Europe, in the preservation of the balance of power, national existence is secured by the maintenance of immense standing armies. England adds a great preponderance of sea power. In their relation to each other, community of interest has given rise to the Triple Alliance; France clings ecstatically to Russia; England dallies with that nation which for the while best suits her purpose. All are committed to the policy that a state advances itself by territorial acquisition, and there does not exist a barren waste or fertile field in the Eastern hemisphere that is not regarded with the covetous eyes of these rapacious nations. That their gaze reaches to the Americas none can doubt. England already possesses not only the country to the north of the United States, but also parts of Guiana and Honduras, Jamaica, Trinidad and Tobago, the Barbadoes, Bahamas, Bermuda, and other islands, and on occasion undertakes to push her boundaries within the possessions of other countries. The "Cameron line" attempt upon Alaskan territory brings this most clearly to our notice. Spain owns Cuba and Porto Rico, and France, Cayenne. But for the United States and the Monroe Doctrine, the weak republics of the Americas would be in as much danger from European greed as in the days of the Holy Alliance, or as China is to-day.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The traditional foreign policy of the United States is that of non-interference in European affairs, and hostility to European aggression on this continent. The spirit animating the struggle for independence in 1776 found deeper expression in the Monroe Doctrine, and this has been the cardinal principle of the United States in its dealings with the governments of the world. This policy has been given renewed vitality and a still deeper meaning by President Cleveland, and to-day the United States is sovereign throughout the Western Hemisphere and its will is law; and this is unequivocally the spirit of the people. Attempts have been made by authorities on international law, through the medium of the public prints, to demonstrate that this position is untenable. But the fact remains that each nation has a right to be the sole judge of the extent to which its peace and safety may be jeopardized by contact with the views and systems of other nations. The United States, as a matter of fact, is committed to this policy, and should be prepared to demand its recognition by the rest of the world, otherwise the utterances of our statesmen degenerate into a bumptious Quixotism.

In defence of this policy, an American commission was lately ordered to determine the true boundary between Venezuela and England's possessions. England at first refused arbitration within certain limits. An American decision within these limits would have had what result? War with England would have been almost fratricidal; it would have cost untold suffering and loss to both countries, but we were committed to a defence of any territory which this commission determined as belonging to Venezuela. Were we prepared for such a war? The highest military authority says no. Would this controversy with England have arisen, had the United States possessed a military and naval power such as would have inspired in England the same respect as do the first powers of Europe? Many think not. The first suggestion of this country to submit the question to arbitration would have been accepted.

In this connection it may be interesting to note the cost and strength of the armies of some European nations.

Russia maintains the largest army in the world, at an annual expenditure of $213,000,000, which in time of peace numbers 910,000 officers and men, and 3,077,000 immediately available for any emergency, which is a nucleus for the more gigantic force

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of nearly 13,000,000 men who can be called into service. The Germans come next with their expenditures, to the end that their army of 584,734 may be ready for war, when the force can be increased to 3,700,000, with, under their new law, a prospective strength for national defence of 7,697,356, of whom 4,297,856 are thoroughly trained soldiers. France expends $123,000,000 annually to keep 524,768 officers and men in training, ready to be augmented to a total of 2,930,000 for defence. England and India keep up a regular establishment of 366,000 men, and 865,000 reserves and militia; and these forces can be doubled for war. Spain maintains an army of 95,000, nearly four times larger than our own, with an available war strength of 1,334,000 men. Italy has a peace army of 222,275, and a prospective force for war of 3,397,000. Even Belgium has a force of 43,359, and Holland one of 21,500.

Now a glance at the American side of the same subject. Mexico, with a population of 11,633,000, keeps up a regular army of 35,000. Colombia, with 4,600,000 people, an army of 5,000; Brazil an army of about 24,000 in a population of 18,000,000; Chili an army of 25,600, with a population of 3,500,000. The Argentine Republic, with a population of 4,750,000, maintains 15,000 regular troops. The United States, with 70,000,000 and growing every day, keeps in training about 25,000 men, with an antiquated organization, while to the north lives a population of 5,000,000 people ready to do and die for England. In naval ability suffice it to say that the combined navies of Mexico and South America would not be a barrier to England's West Indian squadron alone.

These are some of the conditions which must be faced in the defence of all America from European aggression. Without the intervention of the United States there is not another government on this hemisphere which could live in the face of a determined foe from Europe. If we had been as little prepared for war thirty years ago as we are to-day France would never have withdrawn her troops from Mexico. Fifty years ago there was time for war after the fact, but there is none to-day. Isolation lives only as a memory. Our military dependence is upon a small, a very small, army and upon the militia. A modern war would probably be concluded before the embryo armies could be brought into being, much less reared into a state of efficiency.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Let us glance at the weakness of such great dependence upon the militia.

It must be borne in mind that there is no subject in which greater scientific progress has been made during the past thirty years than in the appliances and appurtenances of war. The non-professional reader will grasp this fact more readily by reference to the familiar circumstance of the cost and length of time required to build and equip one of our modern warships as compared with the wooden frigates of the line then in vogue. There has been quite as much change and improvement in the armament of troops for battle, and a very much greater need of discipline and preliminary training and drill to make them effective in action. Indeed, there is no comparison between these latter requirements as they exist to-day and what was formerly necessary, and it is this fact which it is so difficult to impress upon the average citizen. The old soldier who advanced to the attack in what he called a rain of bullets would now be greeted with a deluge. The mass of metal thrown from two contending lines of battle will be terrific. The skirmish preceding battle will commence at incredible distances. In the full tide of conflict, squads, sections, companies, and even battalions may in a moment be swept into eternity. In the face of such conditions, common sense would say that victory will reward that command which uses its weapons most skilfully, which husbands its ammunition, and throws its leaden hail with accuracy, and at the command of its leaders, moving ever onward to the attack, forgetting personal danger in its confidence in the wisdom of its commanders, and in final victory. Do we realize the never-ending drill, the discipline, the unceasing vigilance of instruction, the unquestioning obedience, the target practice, the field exercises absolutely necessary, all to bring the soldier to his most efficient state, or, if you please, to convert the individual into as much of a machine as possible? Such essential qualities can come only from the regular training of daily life; and so the question naturally arises, Does the militia fulfil these conditions?

In our country there exists the organized militia, composed of those citizens mustered into the military service of the States, and subject to certain drill and discipline, and the unorganized militia, or that portion of the male population subject to military duty in national emergency. The organized militia num-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bers about 112,000 officers and men, the unorganized about 9,000,000. These figures give about one man in eighty in our militia as performing State military duty. If to these figures be added the regular army, those who have gone out of the service, and those who have had experience in drill at school or college, there will remain forty-nine men out of every fifty who are ignorant of even the rudiments of military instruction.

Everyone knows that there is a great attraction in the States militia for young men who are physically benefited by the drill, who enjoy the wearing of a uniform, and the local prestige of this sort of service. The company is not unlike a local athletic club whose president is the captain; the *personnel* is of high order, and all are upon terms of more or less intimacy; a captain thinks he knows quite as much of military affairs as the colonel whom he may have helped to elect. All look forward to the summer camp as an outing and a recreation from the cares of business; in some States an encampment partakes of the nature of a frolic or picnic, with sweethearts and wives in constant attendance.

Competition in drill has given the militia a very good execution of the manual, fair alignment and step in marching. If an insurrection occur within their State, and against mob violence, they will do their best in behalf of law and order. But the fact remains that these men enlist for recreation and pleasure and the physical advantage of military exercises. To be suddenly summoned to battle would entail great hardship and suffering, and to pit them against experienced regular troops whose entire life has been given to preparation for such action would be almost murderous. The victory in future battles must be with the force having the best controlled and most accurate fire action. Without fire discipline numbers cannot avail. They become human butts for an enemy's bullets. All would recognize the madness of manning a battleship for a naval engagement with militia officers and crew; so too, to give battle with such troops would necessitate a needless waste of life. The quota from the States would be but sacrifices upon the altar of an unfortunate military policy.

There is no question of the patriotism of our people and of the fact that in time of national danger hundreds of thousands would willingly throw their lives into the breach in defence of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

our institutions, and that in the end fidelity and valor would remain supreme, and that the country would rebound from any conflict more vigorous from the healthful blood-letting of war. But while the country might rise supreme from its very ashes, there would be no resurrection of the lives which had paid the forfeit of war; there could be no return to the fireside of the fathers, husbands, brothers, and sons left upon the battlefield. Upon individuals thus left to mourn does the anguish of war fall hardest. The question simply is whether it is the part of good government to demand from our citizens such a sacrifice, such a needless slaughter as would now pay the price of war; or, by a proper preparation in peace to reduce such possibilities to a minimum.

GEORGE B. DUNCAN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

GERMANY'S EXCLUSION OF AMERICAN FRUITS.

BY JOHN B. SMITH, SC. D., PROFESSOR OF ENTOMOLOGY IN RUTGERS COLLEGE.

MUCH space has been occupied recently in the daily press of the United States in discussing the orders issued by Germany that no fruit nor living plants should be introduced into that country without having been previously inspected. The reason given by the German government for this action that there is danger from the San José scale or shield louse is not accepted in American publications as a valid one. It is treated as a mere pretext, and the order itself is looked upon as a concession to agrarian demands. Nowhere to my knowledge has there been a fair statement of the case nor a dispassionate setting out of the actual facts upon which Germany's action was based.

That the matter may be thoroughly understood, it is necessary to say a few words concerning the San José, or pernicious scale, and its effect upon trees and fruits. The insect was first discovered in 1873 by Prof. J. H. Comstock in the Santa Clara Valley, California, not far from San José, in such numbers and so seriously injurious that he described it as *Aspidiotus perniciosus*—the pernicious scale. From the locality in which it was first found it became known popularly as the San José scale, and this name has clung to it. It belongs to that group of insects which live by sucking the plant juices, and are protected by a parchment-like covering or scale. Individually the insect is insignificant, measuring scarcely more than five one-hundredths of an inch in diameter, while the scaly covering may become as large as an ordinary pinhead. It cannot be easily detected on plants when only a few are present, but it becomes dangerous by reason of the numbers in which it appears. A single female may, under favorable conditions, produce, in the course of one year,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1,600 million descendants. The original home of the insect is yet unknown. South America has been charged with sending it into this country, and so has Japan. It is certain that it occurs in both of these countries, but in Japan it is a very insignificant factor.

For a time this scale was the most dangerous insect with which California fruit growers had to deal, but eventually they learned how it could be controlled. The difficulties in dealing with scale insects are due to the fact that the actual, living organisms are protected by the parchment-like covering or scale, which must first be penetrated or corroded before any poisonous material can be brought into contact with them.

Some time before 1887 a quantity of California plum stock was purchased by certain Eastern nurseries and was used largely for budding. The stock was infested by the San José scale, and by means of the buds the insect was distributed throughout the nurseries. The stock itself was sold to purchasers with the result that in 1893 it was discovered that the scale was already well distributed throughout the Atlantic States. It was assumed that California methods of treatment would be equally effective in the East, but within a year or two it proved that this was not the case; that the scale had been much more widely distributed than had been supposed, and that a large number of trees, principally peach trees, had been practically ruined by its attacks. Attention was aroused everywhere and investigations were started in almost every State in which the scale was known to occur.

As it seemed probable that the original distribution in the Atlantic States had been accomplished through New Jersey nursery stock, investigations in that State were very comprehensive. The Legislature made an appropriation of one thousand dollars for the purpose of attempting to introduce the parasite, which, it was said, had aided in controlling the species in California, and the writer visited that State during the early part of 1896 and made a thorough study of the conditions there. It was found that there were great numbers of the San José scale still scattered throughout that region in California in which deciduous fruits are most largely grown, and that the check upon the increase of the insect was largely climatic, though it was assisted by certain predatory beetles which were already natives of the Atlantic States and required no introduction there. It

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was also found that the climatic peculiarities of the West Coast made it possible to use insecticides effectively in a manner which was impossible in the moister climate of the Eastern States. It is needless here to go into details; but the practical conclusion was that the insect would have to be studied in the East from a new standpoint, and that local conditions and peculiarities would have to be considered. Meanwhile new infested regions were being discovered in all the States. Where the insects had been so scarce that they were overlooked in previous years, they were now so abundant that the trees were dying, and a genuine scare resulted.

On March 5, 1897, a convention of fruit growers, nurserymen, and others interested in plant growth was called to assemble in Washington, D. C., and a two days' discussion took place, almost entirely devoted to this threatening pest. The result was a bill, which was presented to Congress, restricting the transportation of nursery stock between States, and providing for a rigid inspection of all plants and fruits to be introduced into this country. In other words it was proposed that fruits seeking entry into the United States should not be admitted without being first inspected or unless they were accompanied by a certificate that they had been inspected. Nothing was done by Congress in 1897, but in that year and in 1898 a considerable number of meetings were held in which the same matter was discussed and State Legislatures were appealed to for protective measures. The proceedings of the convention held at Washington were published by the United States Department of Agriculture; and two bulletins, with a circular, from the Entomological Division of that Department also gave information about the pernicious scale, its destructiveness, and the absolute necessity for preventing its spread, if fruit-culture in the United States were to continue a profitable industry.

At the present session of Congress a new bill has been introduced covering the grounds already mentioned, and practically excluding foreign fruits from the United States until they have been inspected and passed as clean. It carries an appropriation of one hundred thousand dollars, provides for an army of inspectors and empowers the Secretary of Agriculture to make rules and regulations for the examination of nurseries, and for quarantining fruits and restricting their importation to certain ports of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

entry designated by him. In other words, there is now before the American Congress a bill that is quite as drastic in its measures as the decree of the German government.

Germany maintains in the United States, and probably in other countries as well, experts in various branches, whose business it is to report to their government such facts as are considered of interest or importance. It did not escape the agricultural experts that the agricultural and horticultural papers were filled with reports of danger from the pernicious or San José scale; that in the Experiment Stations the entomologists were devoting themselves almost entirely to a study of this insect; that at meetings of horticulturists and agricultural bodies the San José scale formed the principal topic of discussion, that several States had already legislated on the subject, and that restrictive measures were presented to the legislatures of others. I am aware, personally, that information was gathered for at least six months, and probably a year, before any action was taken by the German government, and the decree was finally issued because the San José scale had been actually found upon fruit that had been imported into German territory. When protest was made by our Ambassador, he was presented with the publications of his own Department of Agriculture, of which he had not known, and with other information as to the grave danger to be feared from the insect against which the Germans were attempting to protect themselves. The fact that the restriction upon dried fruits was almost immediately withdrawn proves that it was only a danger believed to be real which was to be guarded against.

Now is there real danger in this San José scale? That it is so considered in this country is shown by the proposed legislation before Congress, which has already met the approval of the Committee on Agriculture of the Senate. Eight American States have laws providing for an inspection of nursery stock; three American States, Maryland, Michigan, and North Carolina, have laws absolutely excluding nursery stock unaccompanied by a certificate that it is free from the San José or pernicious scale. California admits neither fruit nor plants within its borders without an inspection. There is a State quarantine officer at San Francisco who visits every ship which enters that harbor, and permits not a plant to land unless it has been first examined and found to be free from insect pests. Throughout the State

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

there are horticultural inspectors and commissioners who have wide and arbitrary powers. Several other Pacific Coast States have followed California's lead, and in several States bills are pending to protect the horticultural interests of the States from further introductions of this same pest.

Besides infesting trunks, branches, and twigs, the scales crawl upon the fruit and set upon it, producing in most instances a little reddish spot which adds to rather than detracts from its appearance. Such fruit coming from California may be found in any of the Eastern markets at any time during the early summer. In fact, on the fruit stands the finest pears, when they are infested, are usually turned so as to show the red spots, because they improve the look of the fruit. Since the Eastern States have become infested by the scale, fruit of this character has become common in the markets.

The scales after they have once become fixed to the plant have no power of motion. It is only when they are just born, and the female produces its young alive, that for a few hours they are able to move about from place to place. If a twig or branch is cut and begins to dry, all the insects attached to it die and there is no chance for spread or propagation. The reason is that the supply of food is cut off when the sap ceases to circulate. The matter is different when a fruit is infested. The fruit is largely composed of water or plant juices, and the scales continue to feed as long as the fruit remains in sound condition. Therefore, there is nothing to prevent their breeding upon such fruits; and, as a matter of fact, I have purchased at fruit stands in New York City California pears in which the pernicious scale was present in all stages: crawling larvæ, as well as adult breeding females. There is no reason for believing that the same fruit could not have been sent to Germany, and that at Hamburg or Bremen breeding scales and living young could be found upon the fruit.

Whether, on the other hand, there is any real danger of the transfer of the scales from fruit to living plants is a somewhat different question. In the United States there is not, so far as we know, a single instance where this has happened. So far as we have any knowledge, distribution has occurred entirely by means of nursery stock or by means of birds and insects passing from one orchard to another. There is not, however, the slightest

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

reason to doubt that if an infested fruit were by some means carried to a living plant upon which young scales could crawl, the plant would become infested. The only safety lies in rigidly providing against such a contingency. This the German government is attempting to do, and its regulations are no more severe than those already enforced in California or proposed in several others of the United States. If the bill now before Congress becomes a law, all exporters of fruit from other countries to America will have exactly the same reason to complain of the action of the United States that American shippers of fruit now have to complain of the action of Germany.

If all the legislation, actual and proposed, in this country against the San José or pernicious scale is justified, we certainly cannot blame foreign nations for attempting to protect themselves against this same pest. Before we have any right to protest we must prove that the regulation is unnecessary and that no danger in reality threatens the German horticulturist. To do this, in view of all the publications that have already issued from the various experiment stations and from the United States Department of Agriculture, might prove rather a difficult task.

JOHN B. SMITH.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MAN'S SPAN OF LIFE.

BY LANGDON KAIN, M. D.

It is a curious fact that authorities do not agree, within a hundred years, as to the utmost limit of human life, though the question is important enough to be positively determined. A comparatively recent writer, the late Sir George Lewis, did not hesitate to affirm that it is not possible for any person to reach the age of 110; that no one, or hardly any one, ever lives to be 100. Mr. Thom and the late Professor Owen agreed that no one has ever been proved to be more than 103 years and a few months old. Haller, Bailey, Flourens, and other early writers, give accounts of persons of the reputed age of 185 years, and in one instance of 200 years.

Popular opinion, and even expert or medical opinion, is not disposed to accept the limit of Professor Owen. Every little while some eminent medical man takes people to task for dying short of a century of life. A short time before his death the late Sir Benjamin Richardson asserted that seven out of every ten sound and reasonable people ought to live to be 110 years old, and would do so if they took care of themselves. The late Mr. Proctor, the popular writer on astronomy, reports a New York physician as saying that in all his experience he had known but one man to die a natural death, his idea of that being the memorable collapse of the wonderful "One Hoss Shay."

The simple and obvious explanation of the wide differences of opinion as to how long it is possible for any human being to withstand the destructive influence of time is that observers and writers are of different degrees of credulity. It is hard to say why no serious investigation of living instances is made, instead of basing opinion on doubtful cases so long past as to make inquiry futile. Louis Carnaro, St. Mongah, and the others whose

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cases are so invariably cited by writers on this subject, have been cruelly overworked, notwithstanding the power of endurance of the typical centenarian. There is no reason to think the percentage of old people is lower to-day than in the time of Haller, or that people do not live as long. On the contrary, Macaulay found that the annual death-rate of London in the latter half of the seventeenth century was one twenty-third of the entire population ; while at the time he wrote it had been reduced to one-fortieth, clearly by the increased material prosperity and the more human ways of life. That it has been further reduced since then, largely by the development of sanitary science, is a matter of positive knowledge. Since the effect of advanced civilization was to lower the death-rate, it must also have increased the percentage of persons of great age. It may be affirmed, once for all, that the power to resist disease which lowers the death-rate is also the power that prolongs life.

Another common source of error is the census return. There are persons who look upon everything official as necessarily accurate, and though they might be skeptical as to the personal statement of a reputed centenarian, if his age is reported in the census they accept it as virtually proved. They do not consider that, after all, it is the mere *ipse dixit* of the person himself, which the census-taker makes no attempt to verify. It is for this reason that Professor Owen and other careful investigators reject the census reports. The census invariably shows that wherever the intelligence and prosperity of the people are highest, the centenarians are fewest. In a Russian census a significant fact was discovered by Flourens. While the returns included 1,063 centenarians in the Empire, there was not a single one in St. Petersburg and Moscow, the new and the old capitals, the most civilized parts of Russia and the most accessible to serious investigation. The inference was that the intelligent and prosperous people have more accurate sources of information and are more trustworthy in their statements of age than the ignorant.

A striking instance of the misleading effect of the census is recent. A German statistician concludes that civilization, or rather education, is fatal to long life. His basis is the fact already mentioned, that in countries where education is general the centenarians are fewer than in countries where ignorance and poverty are the rule. England, with its 28,000,000 people, has

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

only 146 centenarians, while Ireland, with only 5,000,000 people, has 578. Germany, with 50,000,000 people, has only 78 centenarians, while Norway, with but 2,000,000 people, has 230, and the Balkan Peninsula, with a population of 10,000,000, has 5,542. Switzerland has not a single centenarian in her 2,000,000 population. Spain, with 18,000,000 people, has 410 centenarians. Of the alleged centenarians of Bulgaria and Servia, 290 are from 106 to 115 years old, 123 are from 115 to 125, eighteen are from 125 to 135, and there are three between the ages of 135 and 140. A summary shows that England, Germany, Switzerland, and Sweden, where education is general among the people, having an aggregate population of 84,000,000, have only 234 centenarians. Ireland, Norway, Spain, and the Balkan States, where the reverse is the case, having an aggregate population of only 35,000,000, have 6,760 centenarians.

The German statistician takes occasion to state, as a result of his inquiries, that the oldest man is not, as has been said, a Russian of 130 years, not a retired Russian cabman, Kustrim by name, of 140 years, but one Bruno Cotrim, a negro born in Africa, and now living at Rio de Janeiro, of 150 years. Though he poses as a man "bristling up with small facts, prurient with dates, a braggadocio of exactness," it is significant that he is not surprised that the last figure in the age of each of these candidates should be a cipher, which is against the laws of chance; and that the age of the second should be just ten years more than that of the youngest, and the age of the oldest just ten years more than that of the second, which is also in violation of the laws of chance. He sees nothing strange in the similarity of the names Kustrim and Cotrim, though here again the laws of chance are brutally outraged.

The inference which the German statistician draws from the census returns is contradicted by every list of persons compiled to show the effect of occupation on longevity. Men of thought are most often at the head for length of years. He forgets, too, that even in Germany, though reeking with culture, there are always many thousands who do not partake of the deadly fruit of the tree of knowledge, but are healthfully illiterate. Yet they rarely escape the common fate, dying before their hundredth year. Adam was warned against the fatal consequences of knowledge, but everything else points to the inference, not that edu-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cation and comfort are favorable to early death, but to that already noted—the lack of accurate information as to their own ages and sometimes the mendacity of the ignorant classes. There is the same cause of vanity in being phenomenally old as in being phenomenally anything else.

Whether the excesses of the rich and the well-to-do are so grave as to make their chances of long-living inferior to those of the illiterate, and especially of paupers, has been often and fully discussed. Most observers will agree with the conclusion of Sir George Lewis, and, later, of Mr. Tollemache, that centenarians will generally be proportionally more numerous in the higher social strata than in the lower; and that the apparent reversal of this by census returns and other centenarian records is due to the ignorance of the illiterate poor, especially paupers, to their love of the marvelous and to their self-interest.

Reputed centenarians in this country whose ages exceed a hundred by more than three or four years have no documentary or satisfactory evidence to offer. The oldest, of whose age there is little room for doubt, though the documentary proof is not complete, was Mrs. Emily Robins Talcott, of the age of 105 years and 4 months. She was born near Hartford, Conn., where she spent most of her life, and died of bronchitis April 20, 1896. Her memory, health, and eyesight were good, and she took care of her own room. She had shaken hands with Washington and Lafayette, and had seen Fulton's first steamboat ascend the Hudson. She said her great-grandmother was 107, and that her mother was within a few weeks of 100.

Hiram Lester, who was alleged to be the oldest man in the United States, was a pauper who died in a North Carolina almshouse in the summer of 1896 at the reputed age of 128 years. His only evidence was the statement of his father, who died in the same almshouse many years ago at the age of 115 years, it was said. Noah Raby, also a pauper, an inmate of the almshouse at Piscatawa, near New Brunswick, N. J., celebrated what he said was his 125th birthday on April 1, 1897. He was born in Gates County, North Carolina, his father being a full-blooded Indian named Andrew Bass. He says he was discharged from the man-of-war "Brandywine" eighty-four years ago, but has lost his discharge papers; that he heard Washington make an angry public address at Norfolk; that he began smoking when he was five

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

years old, and has continued to smoke ever since, and has always been a drinker of liquors. It is on his unsupported statement that the people of the neighborhood regard him with local pride. Mrs. Margaret Bowen died near Chicopee Falls, near Springfield, Massachusetts, in May, 1896, at the reputed age of 121 years. She was born in County Clare, Ireland, and came to this country in 1865. Her husband, still alive, is now 78 years old. James Oney, who died in Knott County, Kentucky, in April, 1896, said he was 115 years old, though there are no records in the case. He was born at Mount Vernon, Virginia, near the home of the man who could not tell a lie, had twenty-three children, three of whom were born blind. Of his 178 descendants, thirteen were born blind. He died virtually a pauper, and was fond of whiskey toddy, getting "jolly" to the end. His oldest son, blind, is now living in Knott County at the age of 90, which age is also unsupported by evidence. The father had seen Washington often. Louis Darwin and his wife, French Canadians, living at Saint Paul, Canada, aged respectively 107 and 101 years, have been married 81 years, according to their own account. "Jack" Casar, a negro, who was a slave in New Jersey, the body servant of Mr. John Quackenbush, died at Ridgewood, in that State, December 19, 1896, at the reputed age of 106 years. Mrs. Yetta Gerber died in March, 1897, at 52 Suffolk street, New York City, at the age, it is said, of 106 years. She was born in Poland, and distinctly remembered she was 21 years old when Napoleon passed through the village in which she lived on his way to Russia, and again on his return. A few days before her death she entertained visitors by cracking a filbert with her teeth, of which she had never lost one. Joseph Field, there is good reason to believe, was 104 years and 6 months old when he died, April 1, 1897, near Red Bank, N. J., where he had always lived. He was a farmer with a fortune of half a million. He had remained a bachelor until he was 75 years old, when he married a young woman who bore him three daughters. He was able to walk about until a few months before his death. He had always used whiskey in moderation. Mrs. Goings, who professed to be 109 years old, died at Indianapolis in February, 1896. She said her father was 111 at the time of his death and her mother 106. William Taylor, of Augusta County, Va., died at the reputed age of 105 years and 2 months, at Baltimore, where he had gone in search of work as

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a painter. Mrs. Lorena Huntley, of Moira, Franklin County, N. Y., who was born at Peru, in the same State, died in December, 1896, at the age of 104 years. There is an early family Bible record of her birth.

Hester Jackson, colored, was an inmate of St. Michael's Hospital, Newark, April 16, 1897, which she said was her 104th birthday. She was born a slave at Rahway, N. J., and distinctly remembered that her master, Elston Marsh, was an officer in the war of 1812, and also that she had seen Washington. Jane Brown, also colored, was an inmate of the Home for Aged Colored People in Brooklyn in the summer of 1896, when she celebrated her 103d birthday. She was born a slave in New Jersey, spent much of her life in Philadelphia, and saw Washington. Mrs. Angelique Galipeau, a neighbor of the centenarian Darwins, is said to be 102. She sews without glasses, and walks a mile to church. Her father is said to have lived 110 years. John McKenzie died at Jersey City in December, 1896, at the age of 102. He was called "the best-natured man in the world," and it was to his amiability that his long living was due in the opinion of his friends. Mrs. Martha Squires, of Nelsonville, a small settlement near Peekskill, New York, celebrated her 102d birthday October 11, 1896. She has lived there for seventy years, and her neighbors are confident she is as old as she claims to be. Her oldest child is now 85. Mrs. Clarissa Stebbins Lawrence, of Marlboro, near Keene, New Hampshire, was 100 on January 25, 1896. Mrs. Lydia Turner, of West Concord, New Hampshire, was 101 December 8, 1896. She is in good health, and has "all her faculties." Mrs. Hannah Bartow was 101 May 1, 1896. She lives at New Brunswick, New Jersey, and is the great-grandmother of a child which weighed less than five pounds at nine months of age. This old lady does not wear glasses and keeps a small candy store. Mrs. Cox, of Holderness, New Hampshire, died of whooping cough in 1896 at the age of 101. Elisha Boulden Glenn, of Newark, N. J., was 100 years and 4 months old November 7, 1896. He walked to the polls the same week. Emanuel Schwab, of East Fifty-sixth street, New York, received each guest at the door on the occasion of the hundredth anniversary of his birth, December 14, 1896. He sang a song and read a poem which he had composed the same week. He walks two miles every morning and smokes a long German pipe. John

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Lockhart, aged 100, walked into Parkersburg, Pa., in October, 1896, from his home on Lee Creek, fifteen miles away. While in town he danced a jig.

It is interesting, and it may be profitable, to note some of the cases of extreme age to be found in the older records. Not all of the centenarians were paragons of all the virtues. Thomas Whittington, for example, who lived to be 104, was an habitual drunkard, drinking only London gin, of which he consumed from a pint to a pint and a half daily. Philip Laroque went to bed drunk at least two nights in the week until he was 100. At 92 he cut four new teeth. John de la Somet, 130 years old, was an inveterate smoker. Several famous old people were extremely addicted to matrimony. Owen Duffy, who lived to be 122, married his third wife at 116, "by whom he had a son and a daughter." Francis Hongo, a Venetian, was five times married and was the father of forty-nine children. At the age of 100 his white hair fell out and a new crop of the original color came in. At the age of 112 he had two new teeth. Margaret Krasiowna, a Pole, married her third husband at ninety-four. "She bore to him two sons and a daughter, as proved by the parish register." Margaret McDowal, 106 years old, married and survived thirteen husbands. Among the recorded centenarians are two dwarfs, Mary Jones, 100 years, who was 2 feet 8 inches in height and terribly deformed, and Elspeth Watson, 115 years old, who was 2 feet 9 inches in height. Among the most agile were Mrs. Barrett, who, at the age of 116, climbed a ladder to repair the roof of her cottage; and Elizabeth Alexander, who was particular about her dress at 108, and was used to a daily walk of two miles. Several had peculiar habits. Mrs. Lewson, 117 years old, never washed her face for fear of taking cold, but greased it with hog's lard. John Hussey, 116 years, drank only balm tea as a beverage. John Wilson, the same age, supped always off roasted turnips. Judith Banister, 100, lived entirely on biscuit, bread, and apples during the last sixty years of her life. Old Lord Scarsdale and Lord Combermere, both of whom lived to a ripe age, thought the wearing of a tight belt habitually about the waist had much to do with their excellent health. Macklin, the centenarian actor, abandoned regular hours of eating in the last sixty-seven years of his life, taking food when he was hungry. Two interesting married couples are reported. Mr. and Mrs Cot-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

terell, aged respectively 120 and 115 years, were married 98 years and "never had a quarrel." They died within a few hours of each other. John Rovin, a Hungarian, and his wife, aged 172 and 164 years, lived together 148 years. At the time of the husband's death the youngest son was 116 years old.

The case of Louis Carnaro, first reported by Flourens, is famous for its services to the cause of temperance. He published several books on the benefits of an abstemious life. Born with a sickly constitution and living a dissipated life until he was 40, when he was near dying, he became so moderate in his diet that at last the yolk of an egg sufficed for two meals. It is uncertain whether he lived to be only 99, or whether he reached the age of 104, though he was reputed to be much older. Kentigern, or Saint Mongah or Mongo, is also an evidence of the value of temperance. According to Spottswood his age was 185. One Lawrence, 140 years old, was another temperate man. The Rev. Peter Alley is said by Bailey to have been 111 years old and to have conducted services regularly until a few weeks before his last illness. He was the father of thirty-three children. Other very old persons were Thomas Winslow, aged 146 years; James Bowels, aged 152 years; Margaret Foster, 136 years, and her daughter, 104 years; Zartan, a Hungarian and a proper neighbor of the Rovins, above-mentioned, 189 years; and Joseph Budge, 107 years, who cut new teeth just before his death.

It may be well to explain here the phenomenon of new teeth so often mentioned in the case of centenarians. Professor Owen investigated several instances and found that the gums had receded, as they tend to do in old age, until the stumps of old teeth were exposed and were mistaken for new teeth.

The absence of trustworthy vital statistics is distressing to all who pursue the subject of longevity. The suggestion of Mr. Galton is worth attention, that each family keep a comprehensive record of important facts.

LANGDON KAIN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE SIEGE OF PARIS AND THE AIR-SHIPS.

BY KARL BLIND.

THE day is perhaps not far off when the discovery of proper means for steering balloons will revolutionize both our modes of locomotion and the warfare of nations. Napoleon I. treated the idea of a steamboat as a sheer absurdity on which he wanted never to be spoken to again. On his part, Franklin, who tore the lightning from the clouds, exclaimed, after having seen the first aëronautical attempt, "This is the birth of the child!"

Owing to the risky nature of those attempts, ascents in air-ships were, however, for a great many years so little encouraged that, a generation or so ago, they had mostly become a mere show for public amusement. Only a few men of science continued their studies and their experiments as regards the guidability of balloons. To this day, the problem has not been solved; but I firmly believe that it will be.

In the meantime, public opinion, especially in France and Germany, has become very much awake on the subject. "Since our defeats," writes Wilfrid de Fonvielle, the well-known French scientist and aëronaut,* "things have changed very much. There is no hamlet now in which people do not ask what part the balloons will play in the future war. The novelists, who use their talents for picturing the successes which we shall gain, without fail, through the use of air-ships, may toil ever so much in the way of describing battles sprung from their imagination: their readers will never be tired by it. There is no peasant now who does not follow, with more or less eagerness, in the innermost room of his hut, the question of the navigable balloon. Among the rural population, the air-travellers are, therefore, always sure of the most sympathetic reception." The hope of some in-

*Le Siège de Paris: vu à vol d'oiseau. Par Wilfrid de Fonvielle.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vention being one day able to destroy hostile armies by explosives scattered from above occupies even the mind of the otherwise stolid French peasantry.

M. de Fonvielle warns, it is true, against the notion of science being a perfect magician, able, with one stroke of its wand, to alter suddenly all the conditions of war. At the same time he is himself one of the most zealous, as well as personally most courageous, promoters of that science, having given his proofs in that line during about thirty years. I have known him since the stormy revolutionary days of 1849, when he took part in the unsuccessful rising led by Ledru Rollin against Louis Bonaparte, in aid of the Roman Republic assailed by a French army. Our friendship was renewed when, having been transported to Algiers after the state stroke of 1851, he escaped to London, where for a time he lived as an exile.

With him I made an ascent in the gigantic balloon which, towards the end of the sixties, had been brought over by a number of well-known French aëronauts, Messrs. Yon, Godard, Mangin, Chavantier, and Tissandier. Mr. Glaisher, the celebrated meteorologist, who, in one of his ascents, had attained the greatest height (seven miles), took the direction of the enormous air-ship on that occasion. Shortly before, a balloon of moderate extent had been brought to England by Mr. Giffard. I was accidentally prevented from accepting the invitation to take part in the ascent. On the next day, the balloon exploded through a fire.

When we ascended afterwards in the great captive balloon, the volume of which was no less than 424,000 cubic feet, and its height 121 feet, during such stormy weather that Mr. Glaisher thought at first the enterprise should be given up on that day, we had rather a strange experience. At a great altitude we were bumped about so badly, and at such suddenly changing and precipitous angles, that one of the passengers near me was seized with an insane kind of giddiness. All at once he felt an irresistible impulse to throw himself overboard into the ocean of the air! He was pulled down by those about him; whereupon he sank sideways on his knees, his eyes being then shut in as by blinkers.

There were no seats in the car. We stood like so many bottles in the narrow wickerwork ring, which only reached to the lower part of one's breast, and which was hollowed out in the middle,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

so that the ever-shifting landscape could be seen through it: rather a trying aspect for those given to sea-sickness. The altitude reached was such that the manifold sounds below gradually merged into a music of the spheres, and then into absolute stillness. The jerky movements of the air-ship became at last so abrupt that the danger signal had to be hung out. The hideous part of the voyage was the coming down. It was effected in short but violent pushes, and one felt ever and anon as if the head were thrust into the stomach. For all that, I greatly enjoyed the trip.

"The strong wind," it is said in the work edited by Mr. Glaisher and M. Fonvielle,* "blew at the rate of sixty miles an hour. It whistled through the ropes, the balloon lay over, and the car oscillated violently. We were blown about 600 feet beyond the boundary of the enclosure below. . . . The sky presented an admirable aspect. The sun appeared in the midst of mountains of cloud, and its brilliant rays transformed the Thames into a river of fire. Houses, trees, and streets appeared no larger than children's toys, and the general aspect of things was the same as we experience in ordinary balloon ascents. In some of our aërial excursions we have been to a height of 9,843 feet, and the landscape seen from this altitude is not more striking than from the car of the captive balloon."

This ascent in London had been undertaken for meteorological purposes. Our French friends, Ledru Rollin and Louis Blanc, the earlier members of the government of 1848, had also been invited to a seat, or rather a standing place in the car of that balloon, but both politely and thankfully declined. Afterwards, another ascent, in the same air-ship, was proposed for a fresh meteorological investigation at night with the aid of electrical light. This time, only the Duke of Sutherland and three others—I and my son again among them—accepted the invitation. But M. Yon, as the director, refused subsequently to allow our joining in it, as he thought a nocturnal venture was altogether too dangerous. Still I hoped that permission might yet be given. I, therefore, hastened to return from a lecturing tour in Northern England, but on arriving at Euston Station, the first news I heard was: "The balloon has broken loose!" Shooting up with the velocity of a cannon-ball—as the work quoted says—and rising to an immense height, it fell down after

* "*Voyages Aëriens.*"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

some days in Buckinghamshire. A shred of the skin was sent to me as a memento of our having been so near being "transported to the stars."

Later on, M. Fonvielle kindly invited me to a balloon-voyage across the channel. My friend being rather reckless, I accepted on condition that a man like Mr. Glaisher, or some other distinguished aëronaut of scientific renown, were to be of the party. The proposed enterprise, however, did not take place. Instead of it, a curious race between an English and a French balloon, in which latter M. Fonvielle sat, was started from the Crystal Palace, ending at Havart, on the sea coast. As to who remained the victor it was difficult to decide, owing to the peculiar formation of the soil on that coast.

It is perhaps little known in general how much has been done in France, since the war, by private subscriptions as well as by subventions from communal authorities and from government, for the furtherance of aëronautic science. In the French War Budget, there is every year a considerable item for it. The budget for the army and navy is always rapidly passed, nearly without discussion; all parties agreeing on that point, even the most extreme groups of the Opposition being afraid of making any criticism lest they should be suspected of unpatriotic feelings. Having learned many interesting details on this subject, it struck me that Germany, which in 1870–71 was still far behind the French as regards aërial locomotion, might well look ahead. Some fifteen years ago, in an essay on "Excursions into Cloudland"—which was printed as a series of articles in the Literary Gazette of the Berlin *Vossische Zeitung*—I urged, therefore, the necessity of forming a "Universal Association of German Aëronauts" (including Austria). Though only an outside observer as regards the scientific principles involved in the question of aërial navigation, it seemed to me that such an appeal should no longer be delayed. I was glad to find that an association of that kind was, after a while, really founded at Berlin.

There are some amusing and some very characteristic descriptions in Mr. Fonvielle's work of occurrences shortly before the outbreak of the war. G. Hard's captive balloon, of 1867, which made the fortune of a world's exhibition, having created much stir, Napoleon III. would fain have liked to see, for once, his capital from an Archimedean point. But before daring to rise so high,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the hero of Strassburg and Boulogne thought fit first to send up a General of the artillery and member of the Academy of Sciences, who was to report on his experience. The General appeared in the hippodrome with his Adjutant. Having carefully studied the rigging of the balloon, he concluded that the better part of valor would be to order the Adjutant to make the ascent. This young man had no choice; but during his involuntary elevation he presented a sorrowful spectacle, not speaking to any one. His statement, on coming down, was so uninviting that the General drew up a report, strongly advising the head of the state against these fearful dangers!

Many Germans, says M. Fonvielle, rose in those days in the captive balloon at Paris. He relates that he was in the car once with Professor Virchow, also with the Prussian Crown Prince, who had come several times without giving his name, until he was recognized.

It is certainly true that "the heroic perseverance of the population of Paris would not have been possible had it not made use, during the siege, of balloons and of the carrier-pigeon post, the employment of which the Emperor of the French in the beginning of the war had declined so contemptuously, and the abundant use of which Moltke's General Staff could not have foreseen. Aëronauts may, therefore, well be proud."

All this leads back again to the problem of the guidability of balloons. Here I may bring to mind that the proposal of using the alternate horizontal and vertical air-currents in the higher regions, by which birds are enabled to soar, to poise, and to come down, or to follow a ship without much exertion—a question treated in a recent important paper by Mr. Hiram S. Maxim*—had been hinted at by M. Fonvielle years ago. There is another curious fact of much significance for the solution of the problem. When M. Durnof once rose in the *Neptune*, a young chemist, after a meal taken in the car, threw a chicken-bone overboard. This was enough to make the balloon, which by the opening of the valve had sunk a little, to rise again into an upper air-current! Incredible as this seems, it is an undeniable fact. "Your chicken-bone," M. Fonvielle said to the young man, "will forever remain inscribed in the history of balloons." Movements exe-

* "Birds in Flight and the Flying Machine" (NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, of October, 1895).

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cuted with such wonderful ease point to resources placed by nature at our disposition which may lead to the steering of air-ships.

That balloons will one day become really navigable, and that flying machines will finally be constructed with success—the memory of Daidalos and Ikaros being thus at last avenged—I am fully convinced. At present, it is true, travels in the air involve a risk. And thereby hangs a tale to which the writer of *The Siege of Paris* devotes much space in a chapter entitled: "The Miscarriage of a Diplomatic Mission."

To put a somewhat intricate story shortly, a rumor soon arose, after the return of Louis Blanc to Paris, that he aimed at obtaining the post of French Ambassador in London. Different from many of his French fellow-exiles—some of the most eminent of whom, like Victor Hugo and Ledru Rollin, almost refused learning English—the distinguished Historian of the Revolution had done his best to master that tongue, and to form good social connections in England. It was Fonvielle who advised Louis Blanc to address himself to the Ministry for Foreign Affairs, the government installed at the Hôtel de Ville being yet in hopeless confusion. This, Louis Blanc refused to do; Jules Favre having been, in 1848, an accomplice in bringing about his prosecution and exile.

An interview of Fonvielle with Jules Ferry, which at first seemed promising, not having led to any result, the press was made use of to formulate a demand that Louis Blanc "should be sent to the other side of the channel as an ambassador, not to the Court of St. James's, but to the English people." In this form, the proposition was accepted at the Hôtel de Ville. There Fonvielle was told: "Go and say to Louis Blanc that he himself should draw up the required decree. In the form chosen by him it will be published!"

So it was next morning in the *Moniteur Universel*. About the same time Thiers left England in order to go by Hull to St. Petersburg, where he hoped to have better success than in London. In England he had wholly failed. The extra-official mission of Louis Blanc to England would, it is true, so M. Fonvielle himself avows, have been "tantamount, from a diplomatic piont of view, to the spending of the last cartridge." Still, the announcement of his going had been published in the official journal; and the immediate necessity now was to act upon it.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the meantime, Paris had been surrounded. Nothing remained but the ascent in the balloon, in order to reach London.

"But in vain," writes M. de Fonvielle, "did I entreat my illustrious friend to entrust himself to the winds; it was impossible to overcome his obduracy. Louis Blanc was little, delicate, not accustomed to bodily exercise, and sixty years old; but he was not subject to any ailment, and if he was no longer young, he had kept up the appearance of youthfulness. His behavior made, therefore, a detestable impression upon me. When I saw that I could not obtain anything, I withdrew; and never has Louis Blanc seen me again. I was unable to forgive him his perseverance in refusals. Had I foreseen his repugnance, which showed what fears were at that time excited by aërial voyages, I would have said to the celebrated orator: 'Do not stay in Paris, which is certain to be besieged! Go to London; and in a few days, on my word as an aëronaut, I shall come and hand you the decree concerning your mission!' But could I reasonably foresee such an issue? . . . In my anger I then said to myself: 'Very well! That which Louis Blanc will not do, I shall do.' The secret of my resolution I kept to myself. I did not want to ask for myself that which I had demanded for the man whose friend I was. With my own resources, as a *franc-tireur* of revolutionary diplomacy, I intended to act."

"Was this excess of patriotism excusable on my part?" continues M. Fonvielle. "At all events, the reward of my efforts was that I learnt many curious things, because I was thus enabled, like everyone of the messengers who went out in balloons, to see the siege of Paris from the bird's eye perspective. And that privilege has saved me from what has been called 'obsidional frenzy' (siege craziness), and kept me from committing many mistakes."

Truth to say, Louis Blanc's refusal might have been anticipated. I remember how, in the early sixties, my wife and I once dined with him, when suddenly and unexpectedly M. Nadar, the well-known aëronaut, came in on crutches and bandaged all over. He had had a bad fall from his car, and looked quite the dangerously wounded soldier of aëronautics. I suppose that made a lasting impression on Louis Blanc.

On the siege Fonvielle writes:

"The Germans had accomplished a miracle of strategy with a stunning swiftness. On a single day they took, almost without having any losses, three formidable positions, the whole of which neutralized the action of the forts of Montrouge, Vanves and Issy, and brought more than a fourth of Paris within the range of their cannon-balls and bombs. Clinging to their cars, the aëronauts of the captive balloons could observe with an indignant eye, but powerless, the episodes of that fatal day. They saw the Prussians forming their columns of attack, and the soldiers in zouave uniform throwing away, after a mere sham resistance, their guns, in order to fly more rapidly. With their eyes the aëronauts followed those cowards who ran through the doors of houses, spreading alarm, until the indignant population stopped them."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The first aërial post for the conveyance of letters was proposed and resolved upon in Paris on September 17; but the attempt only took place on September 21. The General Postmaster was an old member of the National Assembly which had been lawlessly dispersed in 1851 by Louis Bonaparte, and for years he had been in exile. He invited M. Fonvielle as an expert for the accomplishment of the undertaking. To his surprise the latter found that the worst possible balloon had been chosen, with which he himself had once had an unexpected fall upon the church-yard of Clichy, when a widow, praying at the grave of her husband, nearly became the victim of the accident. Everything in the balloon was in bad condition—the cover, the net, the valve, and the car. To cap the sorry arrangement, immense heaps of letters, weighing 600 kilograms, were put into a car unable to sustain such a weight. Fonvielle's protest was disregarded. The attempt to rise failed miserably, and his warning was fully justified.

Lest the aëronautic cause should be hopelessly damaged in public opinion by new blunders, M. Fonvielle afterwards recommended, in warm words, the selection of so well bred a man as M. Durnof and the use of his balloon *Neptune*. This ascent succeeded. Durnof rose and did not let himself be frightened by the shot sent after his cloud vehicle by the besiegers. From his car he let trickle down a rain of visiting cards, destined for Bismarck, King William, and Queen Augusta. He had even the politeness, as a true air-travelling boulevardier, nicely to turn down the cards at the corner before throwing them out. "Thereupon," we read, "the Iron Chancellor gave way to unspeakable wrath, and ordained that in future the aëronauts that would be captured by his Uhlans should be treated as spies and be shot from behind."

Seeing that the laws of war, as far as we know, are not made by chancellors, these things, no doubt, happened somewhat differently. "The noise of the powerless shots, cracking at his feet," it is added, "tickled Durnof's French ears most pleasantly, as if they had been so many salvos in his own honor."

However, M. Fonvielle severely blames the organizers of this ascent for "having allowed 20–30,000 letters, indiscriminately gathered together in the letter-boxes, and in which all kinds of follies dictated by fear, or even the reports of spies, might have been contained, to be put, without control, into the car of M.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Durnof. Among the multitude, on the other hand, the success of this aërial trip produced a feeling of happiness as if the enemy had been vanquished in a great battle. Immediately, some thoughtless persons proposed an enterprise the publication of which might have become most injurious to Paris itself."

The proposition, as made in the *Siècle,* was to the effect that an immense balloon, filled with explosive material, should be constructed, whose contents were to be discharged over the German camp.

"Immediately," says M. Fonvielle, "a mass of newspapers became wildly enthusiastic in favor of that plan of a maniac; praising it in words which were even more dangerous than laughable. The fact is, that which would have been quite absurd on our part, *would have been very wise, had the enemy done it.* Considering that the Germans had entirely surrounded Paris, they would have been sure not to miss their aim had they intelligently endeavored to force us to surrender by cleverly launching explosive air-ships from the point where the wind blew into the besieged city. Would this manœuvre not have been quite a simple one if the balloons had been transported by the circular railway which the enemy had taken care to establish round our defensive lines and filled at the nearest forge? Not only did we thus indicate to the besieger a manœuvre of which he had apparently not thought, but we even justified its employment by praising this new kind of bombardment. We even deprived ourselves of the right of protesting against a new means of destruction, of which the enemy could have made admirable use, because Paris formed a circle of ten kilometres in diameter, in the interior of which every projectile from a balloon-car was sure to produce devastation, fire, or death."

I will here only add that the late English General Hutchinson, from whom I have received for many years a number of communications on aëronautic problems, has often warningly written of the possibility of enemies of England using this kind of warfare from the welkin.

A balloon called *Céleste* had been made a present of, by M. Fonvielle, to the administrative authorities of Paris. When this air-ship was sent out, in 1870, he certainly had a special right to take part in the ascent. But as again a letter-post was put in the car, while he, on principle, held this procedure to be a pernicious one, he refrained from joining. He "would not be the aërial postman of the spies." In the *Céleste* an appeal of Louis Blanc to the English Democracy was placed on board in many copies. Another balloon, called *The City of Florence,* contained an appeal of Victor Hugo to the German soldiers, couched in the well-known flowery rhetoric of the great poet. The balloon had, therefore, received a well-fitting name.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Reading of the escape of Gambetta from Paris by means of a balloon, it is with a degree of amusement we find this: "Even in the opinion of well-instructed, intelligent people who were devoted to the country, the upper atmosphere seemed in those days still to be forbidden to mankind as by a jealous deity. The use of balloons was considered impossible without braving unheard-of dangers to which no reasonable individual could be obliged to expose himself, even for the sake of saving the Fatherland. As a proof that this is no exaggerated statement, the following may serve as evidence: When the Chairman of the Committee of Inquiry on the events of September 4 (1870) asked General Trochu why Gambetta had been chosen to represent Government in the provinces, the former President of the Government of National Defense answered frankly, 'Because M. Gambetta was the only one among us who could look without anxiety upon the prospect of a voyage in a balloon!'"

His eagerness of leaving Paris by an ascent Gambetta showed to Fonvielle at a casual meeting. The air-ship destined for his voyage was the *Armand Barbès,* so called after the famed Republican leader who had played a part in the history of the conspiracies under Louis Philippe and in the Revolution of 1848. For two days, however, the meteorologist of the postal administration declared that there was not sufficient wind for aëronautic purposes. "Somewhat enervated by this repeated delay," writes M. Fonvielle, "Gambetta resolved upon burning his ships. In order to make sure of his voyage, he published in the *Moniteur Universel* the decree which charged him with a mission to be accomplished by means of a balloon." And if the fear of such an enterprise was great, the ignorance of the physical conditions under which it had to take place was not less great. The directors of the Northern Aëronautic Station had advised Gambetta to take precautions against the cold with such care as if he had the ambition of recommencing Glaisher's ascent and of measuring the temperature in the highest attainable regions. The Dictator, and his friend Spuller, the trusty companion of his whole glorious campaign, presented themselves, therefore, in full wintery array. They were enveloped in enormous wadded fur mantles, which perhaps were a presage of the Russian alliance!

Bags with letters were put in the car. They were piled up so awkwardly that neither Gambetta nor Spuller could make

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

any move. Both thought it must be so; and fearing any reclamation might be interpreted as an indication of want of courage, they resigned themselves to a voyage in a horribly inconvenient position. Twice Gambetta was nearly falling into the hands of the Germans. Once the balloon was on the point of landing, when peasants gave timely warning. Otherwise, the Dictator might presently have had to bear company with the Imperial prisoner of Wilhelmshöhe. M. Spuller, on that occasion, sacrificed his fur coat. The balloon escaped, while shots were fired after it. Soon afterwards the captain of the air-ship imagined he saw French free-shooters who might help in the landing. He had not observed the German helmets. Gambetta and Spuller hastened to direct his attention to them. A bullet slightly grazed Gambetta's hand.

Then the captain, who seemed to have quite lost his head, was again about to open the valve. The indignant passengers prevented it, forbidding him to land without their leave. At last they gave permission when near a wood. The balloon then came down so rapidly that it caught and stuck fast in the branches of an enormous oak, from which the cloud-sailors were rescued by people hieing thither in great haste. Fifteen minutes later they would have fallen into the hands of the enemy.

The violence of the party feeling which divides France may be seen from a strange fact. The mighty tree on which Gambetta had descended became the object of many visits; but the owner of the soil on which it stood, a conservative member of the Constituent Assembly of 1849, angered by these pilgrimages, had the tree ruthlessly cut down. A column, however, erected from public subscriptions, now adorns the historic spot.

As to the measures taken for the complete investment of Paris, which did not leave any loophole, M. Fonvielle writes: "We could not make any movement whatsoever on land or in the air without the hostile army being forthwith informed of it." The telegraphic net drawn round the city by the besiegers excites his admiration as a man of science. The treatment by court-martial of those taken prisoners in the attempt of destroying this means of communication he acknowledges to be a terrible but necessary measure, from the point of view of warfare. "The Prussian General Staff," he asserts, "has in nowise indicated the part which its scientifically so excellent arrangements may have

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

played in the capture of balloons that fell into its hands. On this important point it has maintained absolute silence. However, we know full well that it is only by means of air-ships that some disturbance could be effected in a service which rendered it possible to keep several million people captives with surprising ease. Of this service the brainless advocates of a so-called stormflood-like sortie had no idea."

On October 12, the balloon *Louis Blanc* rose from Paris to land in Belgium. Here M. Fonvielle says:

"It was so named because the celebrated author of the *Organization of Labor* had stood godfather to it, and quite naïvely was present at its ascent, without having any notion of what would come of it. When in London it became known that the *Louis Blanc* had safely arrived in Belgium, people believed that it was Louis Blanc in person, who would now occupy his assigned post in England. Nobody suspected that it was a Louis Blanc in cotton. The friends of France who persistently expected the illustrious orator, although it appeared to them that he was rather a long time in coming, took fire and planned a demonstration for his reception. Soon the truth leaked out, and immense laughter arose in the ranks of the Parisians and their friends."

I must say that, connected as I was by intimate friendship with Louis Blanc—who repeatedly came to see us again after the war—I was not aware of any demonstration having been planned for his reception. On other occasions—if not in ballooning—he has certainly proved his courage. It should be remembered also, by way of exculpation, that the fear of aëronautic danger, as M. Fonvielle himself states, was then prevalent, Gambetta being the only man in Government who dared face what was looked upon as a dreadful venture. Nevertheless, the author of the work on *The Siege of Paris* broke off from that day all intercourse with his illustrious friend.

In 1872, during the meetings of the British Association at Brighton, we were all three there. Louis Blanc temporarily resided at Brighton with his German wife, who in Paris, during the war, had had to be passed as an Englishwoman. In the list of those wanted as visitors of the British Association Louis Napoleon's name had imprudently been entered as that of "His Majesty the Emperor of the French." He lived in the Grand Hotel and appeared at one of the sittings amidst the loud applause of those assembled. As a Republican, M. Fonvielle, angered by the apparent disregard of the new form of government of his country, occasioned a counter-demonstration before the Grand Hotel

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But even then, though giving vent to the indignant feelings of Frenchmen, he could not enter any more into personal relations with Louis Blanc.* So I, being on friendly terms with both, had to inform the ex-member of the Government of 1848 as to the intended action of M. Fonvielle.

After Gambetta's ascent, another was to take place with the gigantic balloon known from the Exhibition of 1867. It was then named the *Géant*. In 1870 it was baptized *La Liberté*, in honor of Emil de Girardin, the editor of the journal of that name. "The intention was to show to the Germans this air-ship on whose board, when it was a captive balloon, their generals, their diplomatists, their princes, among them the Crown Prince of Prussia, had leisurely overlooked the great careless city which did not then suspect any trap, and which did not think even in its dreams of being one day held in the claws of a black eagle." So M. Fonvielle, though knowing so perfectly well who plotted and began the war, again speaks of a "trap" which had been laid for innocent France!

The balloon *Liberté*, however, took the liberty of escaping with an abrupt movement from the hands of the volunteers who held the ropes. The men suddenly became terrified when a gust of wind drove it sideways. Those standing on that side, when seeing the enormous ball coming towards them from the height of a four-storied house, let the ropes go, and then everybody fled. Curling upwards like a snake, the balloon broke away and fell between the French and German lines near Bobigny. "The Germans," M. Fonvielle alleges, "imagined an infernal machine had been sent towards them. Finally, its stuff was perhaps used for tents of the Landwehr."

Another balloon, the *Bretagne*, also experienced a mishap. Thinking themselves far enough from Paris not to fall into German hands, its passengers landed, and two of them indeed saved themselves. Two others, one of whom broke his hip, were captured; the latter, however, only after having been received, as a wounded man, in the house of the priest at Hermemont. There he was just able to hand over to his host a sum of 7,000,000

* In his continued wrath, M. Fonvielle wrote to me quite recently "I can truly say that you were always ready to take part in any important and sensible aëronautic attempt which was under proper direction, and you would not have acted the Louis Blanc had Berlin been invested by French armies, and had the question been to go to England, in order to endeavor getting aid for your Fatherland."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

francs in bank-notes and in cheques signed by the Finance Minister, M. Picard, which were destined for the purchase of arms and ammunition. The priest carried this treasure over the frontier to M. Tachard, the French Ambassador at Brussels. The arms and ammunition were bought, and served for the new levies of troops raised by Gambetta.

In later years I met M. Tachard—who had partly been educated in Germany, and who speaks German as well as his mother-tongue—in the London International Association for Arbitration and Peace. He is the son-in-law of the late M. Jean Dollfus, the former member of the German Reichstag. In the name of Mr. Dollfus, M. Tachard exerted himself at the meeting of the Association in Brussels (1882), for the re-annexation of Alsace-Lorraine to France. As a member of the Executive Committee of that Association, I had for years to oppose similar tendencies within its Council, until at last I withdrew altogether. The resignation was followed by that of the Treasurer, Mr. George Buchanan, one of the most meritorious members, who also withdrew because re-annexation and neutralization projects concerning Alsace-Lorraine were being continually moved, instead of that Peace Association keeping to the maintenance of the Peace of Frankfort.

Within recent years the priest Thirion, of Hermemont, has been made a Knight of the Legion of Honor, on the occasion of the national festival of July 14, for extraordinary services rendered during the war. Yet, when the Constituent Assembly of 1871 met at Versailles, the head of the Postal and Telegraphic Administration, who afterwards became Keeper of the Seals, had made the astounding assertion that "the balloon service had not led to any events worthy of occupying the attention of the Assembly." On his part, Thiers had, as head of the government, declared that "all citizens who had gone out of Paris in air-ships had equally well merited of the state."

With the balloon *Egalité*, Wilfrid de Fonvielle at last went out of Paris, on November 24, with four companions. Only a few open letters were taken in, and of provisions very little—ox sausage, roasted horse-flesh, black bread, some bottles of claret and coffee. An essential part of the baggage was four cages with carrier-pigeons. About thirty bags of ballast were hooked on the outside of the air-ship. This well-conceived arrangement,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thought out by M. Fonvielle, has since then been often repeated with great success. Soon the cloud-voyagers heard the "German music"—that is, the shots sent after them. M. Fonvielle explained to his companions that at the great altitude to which they had risen all projectiles lose their power, nay, that they could be intercepted and caught up, whilst in falling down they might hurt the enemy himself.

Passing by the fortress of La Fère, the travellers heard a powerful cannonade directed against it by the Germans. At last Brussels was espied, and a landing was attempted in the neighborhood. The anchor had already grazed the earth, but a strong gust of wind drove the balloon up again over two forests. When the landing was effected the balloon split, cut in two as by a blow. With a slight spraining of the foot and an abrasion on the hand, Fonvielle and his companion Bunelle came out of the car. Scarcely three hours had been spent in travelling from Paris to Louvain.

I pass over the efforts made by Wilfrid de Fonvielle in Belgium and England to enlist active public sympathy on the side of France. They were in vain in presence of the irresistible march of events. "I became convinced," he writes, "that we had by no means effaced yet the bad impression of the declaration of war. By disembarrassing ourselves of the empire, we had not ceased inheriting the part of the original aggressor (*provocateur*), which the Vanquished of Sedan had so thoughtlessly undertaken. . . . How dearly we had to pay for the first bullet of the Prince Imperial! How much innocent blood had to be spilt in order to obliterate the ridiculous so-called victory of Saarbrücken!" This is certainly a sensible view.

M. Fonvielle states that the majority of the English press recognized the fairness of the German demands towards the end of the war. "Germany," those papers said, "which had been attacked, did not wish to prolong hostilities. She was compelled to continue them through the obstinacy of Gambetta and his set, and she was in presence, moreover, of a French government which might be overthrown any moment, and therefore offered no guarantee. She asked, besides, for nothing more than for the keys to her house when claiming Alsace. It was necessary to take precautions against a people of firebrands (*un peuple de boute-feu*), always ready to overthrow the map of the world."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In England, the adversaries of Germany at that time consisted of a medley group of disciples of the eccentric French philosopher Auguste Comte; of some Tories connected with Bonapartist financial rings at Paris; of followers of Dr. Kenealy, who for years had upheld the cause of the impostor Orton ("Sir Roger Tichborne"); and of some disciples of Mr. Charles Bradlaugh, who, as he himself afterward avowed, had been asked by Prince Napoleon to step forward as an agitator for the French cause. This close connection between the Bonaparte Prince and the democratic leader of the English Free-thinkers was in those days not known yet. For many years I had often defended Charles Bradlaugh by German writings; and I confess that I was rather taken aback when it came out that for a long time past he had been on intimate terms with the Napoleonic aspirant to the French throne.

In some passages the author of *The Siege of Paris* asks: "What would have happened if Jules Favre, wiping off his tears of Ferrières, had said to England—a country which knows how to calculate—by way of a final declaration: 'If our ally of the Crimean War allows Prussia to take Paris, we shall deliver over Constantinople to Russia!'" M. Fonvielle here evidently forgets that such a declaration would have produced the strongest anti-French feeling in England. A Republic which showed itself ready to hand over the key of Eastern and Southern Europe to Czardom would not be a true Republic any more. Besides, France was not in a position to effect such a transfer; and she is neither in a position to do so now, in spite of Toulon and Kronstadt and the expected visit of the Czar.

But let that pass. When our French friend came to my house in autumn, 1870, after his courageous balloon ascent from beleaguered Paris, he thought "there was still a prospect of rolling back the German invasion." In the presence of Dr. Congreve, I answered that "there was no German invasion, France having declared the war; and that all that had happened since was only the natural consequence of the continuation of hostilities on the part of France. This persistence of hers had the inevitable result of making the conditions the victor must impose more and more severe. The best thing for M. Fonvielle to do would, therefore, be to return to France without delay, and to advocate the immediate conclusion of peace, instead of making

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the useless attempt to excite public opinion in England." Dr. Congreve silently listened to all this. Its correctness was fully borne out by subsequent events. Personal friendly relations have, I am glad to say, not suffered from these unavoidable differences of opinion between Fonvielle and myself.

For the World Exhibition of 1900, the French government has decreed that frequent balloon ascents are to take place in the Bois de Boulogne. Until then, the author of the book hopes that new inventions will be made, exciting the admiration of the visitors. To me he writes: "I see with pleasure that Germany will take part in the Exhibition of 1900. We shall then have a contest for the record of travels in the air; and that will be highly interesting."

In this wish for scientific rivalry all those will join who have progress at heart. Whilst enough has been said here to show the importance which the development of ballooning may some day have for strategy, it is ardently to be hoped that the discovery of proper means for aërial locomotion will vastly enrich the knowledge of the human race, open up to it spheres as yet hidden from its sight, and thus increase the domain of its peaceful conquests.

KARL BLIND.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

RECOLLECTIONS OF THE CIVIL WAR.—III.

BY SIR WILLIAM HOWARD RUSSELL, LL. D., SPECIAL CORRESPONDENT OF THE TIMES (LONDON).

I left Montgomery on the 10th of April for Mobile, on board a huge, wooden, house-like steamer three stories high. For the first time I understood how one of these steamers can burn up. Fire is forever being on the point of becoming master instead of servant. At first the scenes along the banks of the Alabama were novel—cotton slides, wooding stations, cane brakes, landings with railroads running up from the river to the top of the bank, where negroes worked windlasses for loading or hoisting up goods. Selma, the only place of any importance, was passed in the night and, as far as I remember, there was no appearance of any other town in the 417 miles we traversed to Mobile, which we reached on the morning of the 11th of May.

I was very glad to leave the "Southern Republic." The company was not at all attractive, and yet I could not get away from it unless I went to bed; and even there I heard many strange oaths and modern instances of Yankee villainy through the sweltering night air. There was a diabolical steam-organ on deck called a "Calliope," which the captain made it a point of honor to put into full blast whenever the vessel was approaching even a wooding station! It was played by keys acting on valves which let steam from the boiler into metal cups, where it produced high resonant notes, and fairly blew "Dixey" into the marrow of my bones. I looked out on the quay of Mobile, fringed by tall warehouses with shops at the basement; with names French, German, Irish, Swiss, Italian, Scotch, Spanish, English, and Jewish; and I thought what manner of city is this? For there was no sign of life in the street with all these great buildings, from most of which the Confederate flag was flying.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Yes, sir, you oughter see miles of your ships and others along here. But that Lincoln has sent down his cussed war ships on us and we're blockaded for the time! The Yankees are at Pensacola and they are at the mouths of the Mississippi. I guess Jeff Davis will have something to say to them if John Bull does not fix them presently."

On my way to Battle House I saw all the able-bodied population of Mobile drum beating, drilling, marching, the women and children and the gathering of negroes looking on; the Confederate flag flying from all the steeples; streets abounding in oyster restaurants, lager beer and wine bars, gambling and dancing saloons. I enjoyed exceedingly a drive along the Shell Road by the head of the Bay, lined by magnificent magnolias, orange trees, and live oaks, with many pretty villas on the way. Then the market in the evening! A throng of mulattoes, quadroons, Mestizos, in striking and pretty costumes, gabbling in Spanish, Italian, and French, a *lingua franca*. The most foreign looking city in the States, a very turbulent, noisy, parti-colored "Marseilles!"

The day after my arrival I was invited by Mr. Forsyth to accompany the Mayor and the principal men of Mobile in an excursion down the Bay to visit Fort Gaines and Fort Morgan at the entrance. I find in my diary, May 12: "If any judgment of men's deeds can be formed from their words the Mobilians, who represent the third greatest port of the United States, will perish to a man ere they submit to the Yankees and above all to New York." *Ay di mi!* They had no presage of the man Farragut and his doings and influence; no more had Colonel Hardee, who awaited our arrival at Fort Gaines, the author of *Tactics* (one of my friends whispered that he wrote "*Tactitus*"). A refined, delicate, student-like man who was proud of very poor defences there—there was a small garrison and little discipline. One of the gunners asked me "when them d——d Yankees would be coming. He wanted to send them a few pills he thought would be good for their constitution," and a young officer assured me it was "infernal and that he would rather have a week with the Lincolnites than a night with the mosquitoes."

I was determined to see Pensacola and Fort Pickens, the former blockaded by the United States squadron, the latter in possession of the Confederates, under General Braxton Bragg.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I heard of a schooner, the "Diana," a broad-beamed, flat-floored schooner of fifty tons, which the skipper was willing to hire for a certain sum of dollars down. The crew consisted of three loafers and a negro cook. Mr. Forsyth asked me if I could accommodate three gentlemen of Mobile who wanted to go to Pensacola with a passage as my friends.

"But they are not my friends," said I; "I cannot assent to any coming with me who are not neutrals."

"If you are asked if Mr. Ravesies is your friend, will you say he is not?"

"Certainly!"

"But surely you don't wish to have Mr. Ravesies hanged?"

"No, I do not! I shall do nothing to cause him to be hanged, but if he meets that fate, I can't help it."

The gentleman in question and his friends, Mr. Batre and Mr. Lynes, were finally accepted by myself and Mr. Ward on the assurance that they were neutrals. At five o'clock on the evening of the 14th of May, the "Diana," freighted with a small stock of stores, a British flag lent by the Consul, a table-cloth to serve as a flag of truce, left the quay of Mobile and with a favorable and steady breeze ran down the bay, so that at nine o'clock the lights of Fort Morgan were on our port beam, and we lay low on deck expecting the flash of the gun which the skipper declared was certain to be fired if we attempted to run past in the dark without lying to and reporting. The sentries were remiss, or the night favored us, for we were soon flying at a good eight knots through the Swash, a narrow channel over the bar. The water was perfectly smooth, the wind was strong off shore, and the phosphorescent surf looked like a white ribbon fringed with fire. As the "Diana" sped westwards great fish were visible cleaving their paths in flame from the shallows; one, a great shining gleam, came up fast in our wake. Its horrible outline revealed a monster shark. It accompanied us, distinctly outlined in the wonderful phosphorescence, now shooting ahead, now dropping astern, till it suddenly dashed off seaward.

One by one our cigar lights died out, and, muffling ourselves up, we slumbered on deck. I was awakened by the Captain talking with his crew. They were looking at a fire on the shore. "I guess it is some of them Yankees landed from their tarnation

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

boats and 'conoitering for a road to Mobile—let us put a bag of bullets in the old gun and touch it off at them!" It was most likely the watch fire of a Confederate patrol. I strongly objected to any belligerent act. Just at the first glimpse of dawn Fort McRae, Fort Pickens, and the ships of the blockading squadrons were in sight ahead. Presently we could make out the rival flags—the Stars and Stripes and the Stars and Bars—flouting defiance at each other. As the "Diana" crept along toward Fort McRae a schooner with a swaggering ensign at her peak came swooping down upon us from the guard-ship, and, rounding to, lowered a boat, which hailed us.

"What schooner is that?"

"The 'Diana,' of Mobile!"

"I thought so."

The officer came alongside and stepping on deck said, "I am Mr. Brown, Master U. S. Navy, in charge of the boarding schooner 'Oriental.' I suppose you know there is a strict blockade? May I ask who you are and what is your business? You, sir,' (to the skipper) 'make sail and lie to under the quarter of the 'Powhatan.'"

In half an hour more we were quasi prisoners in the Captain's cabin of the frigate, undergoing courteous but close examination from Lieut. David Porter, who was awaiting instructions from the flagship, the "Sabine," a 50-gun sailing frigate, the first I had seen since I bade Victor Gleichen good-bye on board the "Leander" in Balaclava, six years before. These were signalled presently, to the effect that we were to be sent on board. Captain Adams, the senior officer, a gray-haired veteran, in the gentlest possible manner made strict inquiry into our *raison d'etre*. He smiled quietly as he remarked: "You were actually running the blockade! May I ask for what object?" We each and severally explained. Captain Adams finally decided that the "Diana" was to be permitted to pass into Pensacola Harbor, and thence to return to Mobile, whilst Mr. Ward and I were to visit Fort Pickens, if Col. Harvey Brown, the Commandant, allowed us. But it was impossible to permit the gentlemen from Mobile to visit the United States fort.

When we got back to the "Diana" I told the skipper to "up stick and away for Pensacola!" He exclaimed, "Well, that beats all! I never heard of such a thing. Wonder what old Brown

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and Pickens will say to it?" I had table cloth No. 1 hoisted to the peak as a flag of truce, and stood boldly on, soon gaining a view of the Confederate camp, the shore batteries and the troops moving on the wooded plains between McRae and Barrancas. "Yes," I thought, "here is a 'state of war' indeed. What will Mr. Seward say? He has been ding-donging into my ears that the Southern States are not really anti-Northern. Only a set of noisy, factious slave-owners in each State were for secession; the majority were sound for the glorious Union!" When I left he was urging Lord Lyons to promise that the British government would *never* acknowledge the Confederacy! Here it was not to be ignored. The United States Navy Yard at Pensacola, its factories, slips, storehouses, covering 300 acres; the forts at the entrance, the works which cost the United States not less than £6,000,000, were placidly flying the Stars and Bars, and rebel zouaves, chasseurs, guards, etc., were in full possession. *Beati possidentes!*

General Bragg received me very corteously. I spent the afternoon with him at headquarters, dined with him and his staff and found amusement, interest, and information in his conversation—a stern, grave man with a grim humor which gave piquancy to his talk. He looked every inch a soldier, and he talked like a man with his head well set on his shoulders and yet he made no great mark in 1861–3.

"These black Republicans of the North would," he said, "become slave-owners if they settled in Louisiana to-morrow! They would discover that they could not till the soil without the labor of the black race, and the only way to make them work is to hold them in servitude. Why, Harvey Brown, sir, at Fort Pickens over the way carried off a swarm of negroes from Tortugas the other day to work at his fortifications. Why? Because his white soldiers were not able for it! No! the North is bent on subjugating the South, and we would resist such an infamous attempt to the death."

He opened his maps and plans, explaining the position of his works and the line of fire of every gun in them. "I know every inch of Fort Pickens. I was stationed there after I left West Point and I know every stone in it as well as Harvey Brown does."

Next morning early I was on General Bragg's "war horse"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and rode all round the works in charge of an aide-de-camp. If any man says that he enjoys a ride in and out of batteries or emplacements for guns, each like one pea to another, of a hot morning in Florida, on a campaigning charger seventeen hands high, he must be an enthusiast. After a farewell visit to General Bragg I went aboard the "Diana." The skipper was utterly confused by this time and did not know whether he belonged to the Confederate States, to Abraham Lincoln, or to the Britishers.

"You don't mean to say," he exclaimed when I told him to steer for Fort Pickens, "you are going to bring the 'Diana' along side to that darned Yankee port?"

Our table cloth was again hoisted to the peak and the "Diana," with a fine breeze, ran across to the island where Fort Pickens showed its grim front under the Stars and Stripes. Major Vogdes, whom I had seen on board the flag ship; Captain Barry of the United States Artillery, and Mr. Brown of the "Oriental," received us at the jetty. I was an object of interest to them. I had come from the enemy and could tell all about them and their works if I pleased. Major Vogdes, in particular, displayed a subtlety and ingenuity in this pumping process which would have secured him a high reputation as an examiner in a court of law, but he gained nothing from it.

Exhausted by a second promenade through casements, magazines, bakehouses, ramparts, I was glad to bid good-bye to Fort Pickens. The "Diana," with her tablecloth flying, ran across towards the Confederate Navy Yard; and, having left the Mobile gentlemen on shore there, we stood out seawards between Pickens and McRae in the hope of reporting to the "Oriental," which must be waiting for us westward. I turned in, directing the skipper to call me when he saw her.

I was awakened from a sound sleep by the negro cook.

"There is a man-of-war after us."

I popped my head above the hatchway—the skipper was at the helm.

"What's the matter?"

"Well," said he, "there's been something running after us for the last two hours. I don't think he will catch us up no how if the wind holds."

"But, good heavens, man! it may be the 'Oriental.' Luff a bit and see who it is! It may be Mr. Brown."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Mr. Brown or no, I can't help carrying on, for if I don't hold my course I'll be on a bank in a minute!"

The stranger's sail shivered.

"There, she's stuck again!" The skipper grinned with delight. "I'll lead him into a pretty mess."

Ere the "Oriental" was afloat we had shot through "the Elbow," and we glided past Fort Morgan in the early morning without a challenge. But we spent the next fourteen hours in beating up to Mobile, where I landed pretty well done up at five o'clock in the evening. I passed two days more there in society charged with Confederate electricity. I was introduced to the young ladies of the "Yankees' Emancipation Society," who spent their days sewing flannel cartridges for cannon, carding lint, preparing bandages, and expressing the most ferocious sentiments, which came with ill grace from their pretty mouths. "Wait till you hear what they say at New Orleans!" Among the most interesting of the exponents of these principles was Dr. Nott, who, with Mr. Gliddon, wrote *Types of Mankind*, a work in high repute, to which I have already alluded. The cubic capacity of the human cranium was the measure of possible civilization—a head that will contain the largest quantity of snipe shot must dominate any head of inferior capacity. Dr. Nott detested slavery. "But what is to be done with the slaves? How are four millions of negroes to be prevented from becoming twice as many, especially if their growth is stimulated by high prices for the produce of their labor?" Judge Campbell, late of the Supreme Court of the United States, was equally convinced that all sound legal arguments were on the side of secession and that the decision in the "Dred Scott" case was irrefragable.

On May 20th I left Mobile for New Orleans in the steamer "Florida," wherein I had a pretty cabin, popular with the mosquitoes.

There was a table of regulations on the wall.

"No. 6. All slave servants must be cleared at the Custom House.

"No. 7. Passengers having slaves will please report them as soon as they come on board."

I was kept awake for some time by preliminaries for duels in the saloon outside my cabin; and then I had a struggle for life with the mosquitoes, which ended in sleep from deep exhaustion.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The passengers were routed out in the early morning to take their places in the train for New Orleans, six miles distant.

The Confederate flag flying from every public building and most private houses, Turcos, zouaves, chasseurs, Lafayette, Beauregard, MacMahon guards, Pickwick, Irish, German, Italian, Spanish volunteer corps—New Orleans looked like a suburb of the camp at Chalons. It was curious to hear the conversation in the St. Charles Hotel. "Lincoln's villainous emissaries had violated the sanctity of private correspondence," in other words, the United States Marshals had seized the telegraphic dispatches of the last twelve months in all the offices of the Union. Then "the piratical fleet of Lincoln" had been seizing Confederate trading ships. The leading gentlemen of the city were by no means negligent of the reputation they had established all over the Union, where New Orleans was known to be rich in the Sallusts and Luculluses of the States, and I had full opportunity of judging of the excellence of the Creole *cuisine*. At Major Ramsey's one of the slave servants who waited at table was a son of General Andrew Jackson, who defeated the British, and he was, therefore, quite a fancy article. In that connection, Mr. Morse told me that there were no cotton bag fortifications, that only seventy-five bales had been used in the construction of a battery, and that these and some sugar hogsheads constituted the sole parapet of the trenches.

I paid visits to the estates of Governor Roman, Governor Manning, Mr. Burnside, Mr. McCall, Dr. Cotman, etc., and had an insight into the sources of the enormous wealth which in prosperous times is raked out of the mud of the Mississippi. Astounding crops of corn, sugar, and cotton! One host of mine who had come from the North of Ireland as a cabin boy to New Orleans, and was not yet fifty years of age, told me that he had in 1857 purchased an estate, 6,000 acres in one field, for £300,000 and another piece of land of 8,000 acres for £150,000; 6,000 acres grew sugar-cane, 16,000 were under Indian corn to feed his slaves, and he had still 18,000 acres to be reclaimed and turned into gold. It was difficult but necessary to escape from those hospitable planters who pressed upon me the righteous duty of advocating peace in the form of a recognition of the Confederate States and the raising of the Yankee blockade.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I began the ascent of the Mississippi from Donaldson to Baton Rouge, and on from Natchez to Vicksburg, where I took up my quarters at the Washington Hotel.

The day I arrived I was requested to attend a meeting of the principal citizens in a large room around a table graced with bottles of wine, jars of whiskey, blocks of ice, boxes of cigars, etc. It was a *Tabaks concilium* for the discussion of the news of the day, much of which was new to me. The villainy of Lincoln in suspending the writ of Habeas Corpus in the case of Merryman was particularly rubbed into me. The venerable Taney, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, had issued a writ of Habeas Corpus and yet a military myrmidon of Lincoln's had refused to obey it. Where is our Constitution? The lawyers in the room declared the judge's argument against the suspension was unanswerable, and I found it rather inconvenient to give a decision on the point when it was referred to me. "*Inter arma silent leges.*"

In the afternoon next day I proceeded by train for Jackson, highly honored by a punch on the platform given by the citizens, and in two hours I was received at the Capital of Mississippi by a namesake of mine, who had been involved in the Irish national movement of 1848, and who had left his country for his own good; for he had got to possess influence and dollars which he would never have attained in Dublin. The streets looked like schemes of builders, who intended to have them completed at some future period. Wooden houses, brightly painted, with white porticoes and pillars, churches, and chapels with bloated cupolas and spikey spires; the State House, a pile of stone with open colonnades and an air of importance, which was dissipated by close inspection. Within was the Governor, a grim, tall, angular man, who in his youth had been a Natty Bumpo or a Davy Crockett, hunting and trapping in the Far West. A stern Puritan slave-owner, content with his emoluments of £800 a year, and perfectly satisfied that he was at the top of the tree in civilized life, though there were more assassinations and murders in Jackson than there were in mediæval Venice or Florence in any year gone by. He actually said with the air of simplest conviction, "The Sovereign State of Mississippi can do a great deal better without England than England can do without Mississippi."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

As I went on from Jackson towards Corinth I might have fancied I was involved in some strange crusade to destroy some infidel power. At a station where stone pillars mark the boundary of Tennessee and Mississippi I saw a two-storied house crammed with negro men and women; a fellow in flannel shirt and slippers, with long, straight hair, and a heavy whip in his hand, was standing at the door as if in charge of the house, and one of the passengers had some little talk before the train moved on. "There is as prime a lot of Virginia niggers as I have seen for a long time, and Sam wants to realize, for the news looks bad; so I advise you to have a deal if you want them."

At Memphis, on the Mississippi, there were more comforts and luxuries than there were at Memphis on the Nile. The march of empires had gone thousands of miles westward and left this remarkable exhibit, of which Gayoso House was not an unpleasant incident in its way. General Gideon J. Pillow very courteously sent an aide-de-camp to invite me to accompany him to inspect Fort Randolph and the batteries commanding the river. He had been a solicitor, in business with President Polk, but had changed his pen for the sword in the Mexican war, where he served with distinction, was severely wounded, returned to business, and engaged in it till secession summoned him to the field. A compact, clean-shaven man, with short gray whiskers and a pompous manner of speech. Shot and shell were ready beside the guns commanding the stream to prevent "Federal ruffians" from passing down from Cairo, where General Prentiss commanded. But I was not impressed by the discipline of the troops—splendid-looking fellows, tall, strong and bold. They kept up a running commentary on the speech which General Pillow thought it necessary to address to them. When one of the officers called out "Boys! Three cheers for General Pillow," the rank and file responded with war-whoops, a stentorian voice shouted out, "Who cares for General Pillow?" No one answered.

After visiting Randolph Point and Fort Pillow, I wrote what I did not say or print at the time: "Though they were strong positions, gunboats could run past them without serious loss." I returned from camp to Memphis and found letters. The Federal fleets had closed the ports. My artist friend had bolted at New Orleans, and I was left in the midst of secession when I ought to be at Washington, whence communications were open with the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

world. Mr. Jefferson Davis was prepared to receive me and to enable me to see all that was most interesting at Richmond. But of what use would it be if my communications were cut? So I sat down in the steamer to write my last dispatch from "Dixey." My position, if not unique, was certainly difficult. I was received by the Southern statesmen, soldiers, and leaders as a confidential friend, whilst I was utterly unable to do them any service or to turn to account the information they afforded me. I was conducted over forts and camps and was made acquainted with general objects and designs, but I could not write what would be in the hands of the authorities of the Northern States in the columns of a London newspaper in a very few days. As to the preparations of the Federal States I could reveal nothing; but though I was accompanied by a well-known American gentleman of Southern proclivities, I was regarded with suspicion by the rank and file of the slaveowners. I had made many most charming acquaintances, some of whom were to make their names known in the coming struggle in which many were to lose fortune and life. I did not meet Stonewall Jackson, Ben McCulloch, Ewell or Twiggs; but I had seen, without knowing who it was till afterwards, the greatest of all the soldiers of the Confederacy, Lee himself. I found Southern gentlemen hospitable and kindly—men like King, Trescot, Elliot, Hayward, Pringle—well educated and accomplished, a marked contrast to the mass of the people amongst whom they lived. A universal faith upheld them against the strength and wealth of the North. The first sermon I heard at Savannah was directed to prove not only that slavery was a divine institution, but that it was the necessary foundation of civilization and good government! "England must interfere; Cotton is King." But some there were who doubted. Commodore Tatnall, a white-headed, blue-eyed, ruddy-cheeked old man, who had served under the Stars and Stripes for more than forty years—his wife a Northern woman, his friends in the North—felt, as he said, "like a man blown into the air by an explosion. But his course was clear for all that. His State had gone out and he could not fight against the country that gave him birth." When General Lawton, at Fort Pulaski, remarked that they could whip the Yankees by land, whilst the Commodore could take care of them at sea, Tatnall said: "Where are the ships? I have no fleet! Long before the South has a fleet to cope with the North, my bones

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

will be whitening in the grave!" So I told General Pillow that I was going to Cairo within the Federal lines and would thence proceed to Washington. I did not think it necessary to assure him that my lips would be sealed as to the military movements I had witnessed. I am bound to say General Pillow did not ask me to make any promise.

I bade the General, his staff, and the officers with whom I dined at the Gayoso at Memphis a friendly good-bye. They could not quite understand why I should be going up to "the Black Republicans at Cairo." Colonel Faxon, of the Tennessee Tigers, who edited *The Columbus Crescent*, was very angry with the Federals.

"The mosquitoes of Cairo," he wrote, "had been sucking lager beer out of the dirty Dutchmen there so long that they were bloated as large as Spring opossums! Some Columbus mosquitoes went up the other day to suck, but as they have not returned, it is probable they died of D. T. In fact, the blood of a Hessian would poison the most degraded tumble bug in creation."

I suppose every man in the camps of Tennesseeans, Missourians, Kentuckians, and Mississippians who survived the ordeal of battle has long since joined the majority. On the afternoon of the 19th of June, I embarked at Columbus.

W. H. RUSSELL.

(*To be Continued.*)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

EX-SENATOR HENDERSON AND THE ARBITRATION PROJECT OF THE PAN-AMERICAN CONFERENCE.

In THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW for September and October, 1890, I published a paper on the Pan-American Conference, which had then just met, and in which I tried to give an idea of what took place in the same, from the point of view of one of the Latin-American delegates, which I thought of interest for the government and citizens of the United States, especially in case that at a future time a similar Conference should be convened. In the second part of that paper, speaking about the arbitration project reported by the Committee on General Welfare of that Conference, of which ex-Senator Henderson, the first of the United States' delegates, was the Chairman, I mentioned the fact that that project was reported in the last session of the Conference, and therefore too late for a fair discussion, and judging from what I had heard at the time, especially from Senor Quintana, an Argentine delegate and a member of the same Committee, and from the natural disposition of Mr. Henderson to be deliberate and careful in anything he does, I thought, and expressed it in rather harsh terms in the first edition of this paper, that he was responsible for the delay of the Committee of Welfare, in reporting to the Conference the arbitration project.

When my article was published Mr. Henderson informed me that I had done him an injustice, and that he was in no way responsible for that delay. I assured him that I did not have any intention to be unfair with him or with anybody else connected with the Conference, and that if he would do me the favor of writing a memorandum of the case, I would publish it at once as a correction of my statement. He did not do so at the time, and when I prepared a second edition of this paper, I begged of him again to make his statement of the case, and he kindly sent me a letter dated on the 14th instant, containing the history of his connection with the arbitration project presented by the committee of which he was chairman, with two annexes referred to by him, all of which I am glad in justice to Mr. Henderson to append to this paper.

WASHINGTON, February 24, 1898. M. ROMERO.

WASHINGTON, D. C., Feb. 14, 1898.

MY DEAR MR. ROMERO:

In compliance with my promise to that effect, I herewith forward you a brief explanation of the action of the Committee on "General Welfare" in the International Conference on the subject of arbitration.

In February, 1890, two plans for arbitrating controversies between the American Republics were pending, one known as the plan of the Argentine and Brazilian delegates and the other as that of the United States.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Argentine-Brazilian plan is enclosed, marked A. The plan offered by myself is enclosed and marked B.

At a meeting of the committee, held on February 19, 1890, it was unanimously agreed that the general principle of arbitration for the settlement of disputes should be accepted.

Dr. Quintana, of the Argentine, then propounded the following proposition to be voted on by the committee, to wit: "Shall arbitration include all questions of controversy present and future?"

The discussion which followed its introduction drew forth the admission of its friends that its adoption was intended to operate as an approval of the principles enunciated in the 5th, 6th, 7th, and 8th clauses of the Argentine-Brazilian scheme of arbitration.

A declaration of this character was, of course, offensive to the representatives from Chili; and would necessarily make all the states, under any general plan of arbitration, parties to the controversy between Chili on the one side and Peru and Bolivia on the other. Its adoption, in my judgment, meant even more than this. It would suggest an invitation to wage wars by pledging to the aggressor total immunity against any possible loss of territory as the result of such wars.

My first object was to exclude the construction so palpably offensive to Chili. I therefore moved to amend the proposition as follows, to-wit: "Shall arbitration include all *new* questions of dispute which may arise after these articles shall be accepted, whether growing out of disagreements, past or present?" The vote on this (my amendment) was as follows:

Ayes—Henderson.

Noes—Cruz, Velarde, Hurtado, Quintana, Valente, Bolet Peraza.

When the Committee reached the question of the formation of the tribunals of arbitration, I offered the plan embodied in the first four articles of the bill or ordinance presented by me and herein refered to as B.

Ayes—Henderson and Hurtado.

Noes—Cruz, Velarde, Valente, Quintana and Bolet Peraza.

Mr. Quintana then proposed the third and fourth articles of the Argentine-Brazilian plan, and his proposition was adopted by the same vote as the one last recorded.

It will be seen that my views were entirely over-ruled, and that such was the understanding of the Committee; and thereupon Mr. Velarde of Bolivia moved a special committee, consisting of Quintana, Hurtado, and Cruz, "to put into shape and form the articles voted upon." The Committee again met on February 27, 1890, to receive the report of the sub-committee. The Secretary's report of the proceedings of the Committee on this occasion reads as follows: "Mr. Quintana, Chairman (of sub-committee), stated that, as it was understood that a plan would be presented by the Honorable, the Secretary of State, on arbitration, to the various members of the Committee on General Welfare, the sub-committee had deemed it advisable to defer its report until said plan had been duly considered; but his committee (sub) would endeavor to present its report before Mr. Henderson's departure for the West." Immediately after this announcement Mr. Valente again called up the Argentine-Brazilian plan, and moved that articles 2, 6, 7 and 8 thereof be considered and adopted.

I at once moved to amend Article 6 by inserting between the words "convey" and "any" the words "to the offending nation." I also moved to amend Article 7 by striking out "the" between the words "to" and "hostilities" in the first line, and in the fourth line of Article 7 to insert between the words "territory" and "they" the words "to the offending nation." I also moved to amend the first line of Article 8 by striking out the word "whether" and inserting the word "when," and in the same line to strike out the words "or the consequence" and insert the words "and purpose." After long discussion the original resolutions together with my amendments as aforesaid were referred to the sub-committee to be considered and reported on as early as practicable.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I now declare to you that the great delay of my Committee on General Welfare to make report on the subject of arbitration was wholly and entirely caused by the failure of this sub-committee to formulate the plan or scheme of arbitration for the action of the Conference. Why this delay was adopted as the seeming policy of this sub-committee I have no reason to assign. It was appointed on February 19 and did not report until April 9. This neglect is not, in any sense, chargeable to me. I repeatedly called on Dr. Quintana and the other members of the Committee, both before going to St. Louis and after my return, and urged immediate action in order that ample time might be given to the Conference for consideration of so important a subject. My views had been overruled and the whole subject removed from my charge by the deliberate action of the Committee. Principles had been enunciated by the Committee as the basis of action by the sub-committee, to which I could never give my assent. At my solicitation much of this objectionable matter was rejected and thrown out by Mr. Blaine as wholly impracticable and impossible of acceptance by the people of the United States. So far from Mr. Blaine's commanding or even requesting me or my colleagues to support the Argentine-Brazilian plan, he, at all times, considered it in its original form as wholly indefeasible if not absurd.

Yours truly,

J. B. HENDERSON.

A.—PLAN OF ARBITRATION SUBMITTED BY THE MEMBERS FROM ARGENTINE AND BRAZIL.

Considering, That the international policy of the American Conference should be characterized by reciprocal principles and declarations of mutual security and respect among all the states of the continent;

That this feeling of security should be inspired from the very moment in which the representatives of the three Americas meet for the first time, so as to show that their acts and resolutions are in accordance with sentiments of mutual respect and cordiality;

The Conference, being also desirous of giving assent to the principles which to the honor of the strong states have been established by public law for the support of the weak, and which are confirmed by the ethics of nations and proclaimed by humanity, it is hereby declared:

First. That international arbitration is a principle of American public law, to which the nations in this Conference bind themselves, for decision, not only in their questions on territorial limits, but also in all those in which arbitration be compatible with sovereignty.

Second. The armed occupation of the disputed territory, without having first resorted to arbitration, shall be considered contrary to the present declarations and to the engagements entered into thereby, but resistance offered to such act of occupation shall not have the same character.

Third. The arbitration may take place in an unpersonal form whenever the states agree to the election of only one arbitrator; but if it takes place in a collective form, there shall be appointed an equal number of judges by each party, with power to elect an umpire in case of disagreement; said election to be made at the first meeting of the Tribunal.

Fourth. The election of arbitrators shall not be subject to any limitations nor exclusions; it may devolve either on the governments represented in this Conference, or on any other government deserving the confidence of the parties, and also on scientific corporations, or on high functionaries either of the interested states themselves or of other neutral states.

Fifth. The present are applicable not only to differences which in the future may arise in the relations of the states, but also to those which, in a direct form, are now in actual discussion between the governments; but

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the rules to be made shall have no bearing upon arbitrations already constituted.

Sixth. In cases of war, a victory of arms shall not convey any rights to the territory of the conquered.

Seventh. The treaties of peace which put an end to the hostilities may fix the pecuniary indemnifications which the belligerents may owe to each other, but if they contain cessions or abandonment of territory they will not be concluded, as far as this particular point is concerned, without the previous evacuation of the territory of the conquered power by the troops of the other belligerent.

Eighth. Acts of conquest, whether the object or the consequence of the war, shall be considered to be in violation of the public law of America.

WASHINGTON, January 15, 1890.

B.—ARBITRATION PROJECT SUBMITTED BY MR. HENDERSON TO THE COMMISSION OF GENERAL WELFARE OF THE INTERNATIONAL AMERICAN CONFERENCE ON FEBRUARY 19, 1890.

1. If any of the nations assenting to these articles shall have cause of complaint against another, it shall cause formal notice thereof to be given to the offending nation, specifying in detail the origin and character of such complaint and also the redress which it seeks.

2. The nation receiving notice of such complaint shall as soon as practicable, and within a period not exceeding three months thereafter, furnish a full and explicit answer to such complaint, and cause the same to be delivered to the State Department or other especially accredited agent of the complaining nation.

3. If within three months from the time of delivering such answer no agreement shall have been made for the final settlement of the questions in dispute, then each of said nations shall appoint five members of a Joint High Commission, who shall meet together as soon as possible after their appointment for the purpose of hearing and considering the questions of difference. They shall adopt for themselves rules of procedure and notify each nation thereof; and they shall hear and consider the case presented by each, and within six months from the time of their first meeting they shall report to the nations interested the result of their deliberations.

If, in determining any question coming before them, the members of the Joint High Commission fail to agree, they shall select an umpire who shall then and thereafter become a member of the Commission.

4. Whenever the Joint High Commission, appointed as hereinbefore provided, shall fail to agree, or when the nations appointing them shall fail to accept and abide by their decision, either or both of the contending nations may give notice of such failure to all the nations signing these articles and becoming parties thereto, and there shall then be formed a High Tribunal of Arbitration in manner following, to wit: Each nation receiving the said notice shall immediately transmit to the nations in controversy the names of four persons, to be selected by the Executive Department of the Government so selecting them, and from the list of such persons the nations in controversy, beginning with the complaining nation, shall alternately strike out one name until the number shall be reduced to nine, which nine persons shall constitute a Tribunal.

The Tribunal thus constituted shall, by writing signed by the members or by a majority of them, appoint a time and place of meeting and give

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

notice thereof to the parties in controversy; and at such time and place, or at other times and places to which an adjournment may be had, it shall determine the rules of its proceedings and thereupon hear the parties and decide between them; and the decision when made or signed by the majority of the members thereof and delivered to the nations in controversy, shall be final and conclusive.

If any nation receiving the notice and request to appoint members of such Tribunal shall fail to transmit the names of the four persons as herein provided within two months after receipt of notice to do so, then the states in controversy shall each appoint two persons in their places, who shall be subject to ultimate rejection in the same manner as those appointed by the neutral states; and if either of the parties to the controversy shall fail to signify its rejection of a name from the list, as herein required, within one month after request from the other to do so, such other may reject for it. If any of the persons selected to constitute this Tribunal shall die, or for any cause fail to serve, the vacancy shall immediately be filled by the nation making the original appointment.

5. Each nation signing these articles as a party binds itself to unite in forming a Joint High Commission and a High Tribunal of Arbitration in all proper cases and to submit to the decisions thereof, when constituted and conducted as herein required.

6. If any of the said nations shall begin and prosecute war against another wrongfully and in disregard of the provisions hereby adopted for the preservation of peace, such nation shall have no right to insist on the performance of neutral duties by the governments of any of the other states; and in such a case the offending nation shall have no lawful right to take or hold property real or personal, by way of conquest, from its adversary.

"LINCOLN'S SKILL AS A LAWYER."—A CORRECTION.

IN an article under the title, "Lincoln's Skill as a Lawyer," in the February number of the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, appears the following—the language being credited to a Judge Bergen, of Topeka, Kan.:

"The first time I saw Lincoln as a lawyer was in the old Morgan County Court House, at Jacksonville, when he was defending Colonel Dunlap, a wealthy, aristocratic Democrat, in an action for $10,000 damages, brought against him by the editor of what was then called the abolition paper. The action grew out of a deliberately-planned and severe cowhiding administered by the Colonel to the editor, on a bright Saturday afternoon, in the public square, in the presence of hundreds of the town and country people, whom the Colonel desired to witness that novel and exciting performance. Besides local counsel, the editor had employed Ben. Edwards, who was the most noted for eloquence of all the Democratic lawyers in the State. Colonel Dunlap retained Lincoln as one of his lawyers for the defence."

Then follows what purports to be a description of a scene in the trial above alluded to, in which Mr. Edwards, the alleged attorney for the plaintiff, is represented as having "wept and made the jury and spectators weep," while Mr. Lincoln, for the defendant, is pictured as rising in an ungainly fashion, taking off his coat, indulging in "a long, loud laugh accompanied by his most wonderfully grotesque facial expression;" then taking off his cravat and repeating his laugh, and finally removing "his vest, showing his one yarn suspender," after which he began his argument, of which, as the writer states, "the result was to at once destroy the effect

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of Edwards's tears, pathos, towering indignation, and high-wrought eloquence."

Now, it is my fortune to have been the editor assaulted—though not in the place or manner, or at the time, described in the above paragraph. I therefore have some recollection of the events attempted to be described with so much detail. Beyond the fact that there was an assault, a prosecution for damages, and that Abraham Lincoln appeared for the defendant, there is scarcely a single element of truth in this whole circumstantially told story. There was no such "Wild West" gala-day performance as a "severe cowhiding, . . . on a bright Saturday afternoon, in the public square in the presence of hundreds of the town and country people," as invited guests or otherwise; no "Ben. Edwards" connected with the suit for damages; no tears sought to be wrung from the jurors or the spectators by him or anybody else, and, finally, no such grotesque exhibition of buffoonery as that attributed to Mr. Lincoln.

The facts of the assault are these: In May, 1853, as editor of the *Morgan Journal* at Jacksonville, Ill.—not an "abolition," or even a political paper at that time, although it was, later, one of the earliest to join in the organization of the Republican party—I accepted and published a communication criticising the management of the Hospital for the Insane, of which one James Dunlap was a trustee. Dunlap took exceptions to the article and called for the name of the author, which was granted. He then demanded the manuscript, which was refused. Two days after, having occasion to visit the office of the Wabash Railway, I was seated alone with the ticket agent in the office, when Dunlap, accompanied by two of his friends, entered and, without notice or warning of any kind, commenced an assault, striking me one or two blows with a stick he carried, when his weapon was taken from him. There were no spectators except those Dunlap had brought with him, and perhaps a few others who arrived later, attracted by the disturbance.

The following contemporaneous account of the affair is taken from the *Western Freeman* of June 21, 1853—a paper published at Galesburg, Ill., of which Rev. Jonathan Blanchard, then President of Knox College, was editor. After stating some of the grounds of complaint with the management of the Hospital for the Insane—in which Dr. Blanchard had had an insane wife as a patient—he says:

"A member of the former Board (Mr. Becraft) handed to the *Journal* a communication (which was printed) in which some of the above facts were respectfully stated. Colonel Dunlap demanded of young Selby, editor of the *Journal*, the name of the writer, which Selby gave him. He then demanded the manuscript, which Selby declined giving up as what he had no right to ask. Dunlap then proceeded to the ticket office at the railroad depot followed by his son-in-law, McClernand (and one A. C. Dickson), and struck Selby, who was sitting there, a violent blow upon the head with a heavy staff, causing the blood to flow freely. Selby arose and took the club from Dunlap's hand, and also a whip which his attendants furnished him (Dunlap) with, when bystanders interfered and prevented further violence."

So much for the assault and the circumstances attending it, so widely at variance with the story quoted at the beginning of this article. Dunlap was fined $25 in a Justice's Court for breach of the peace, and afterward a suit for damages was instituted against him. My principal attorney was David A. Smith, a high-minded and honorable man, who, like Edward Coles, Illinois' second Governor, had removed to Illinois from a Southern State, bringing his slaves with him and liberating them on free soil. Mr.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Lincoln appeared as associate counsel for the defendant, his services consisting chiefly in a plea for "mitigation of damages," but it is due to his memory to say that he made no such farcical exhibition of himself as described. The utter improbability of his going through the grotesque performance of divesting himself of his clothing until he had exposed "his one yarn suspender," is proved by the fact that the final hearing at which he made his argument was a cool morning in the early spring—March 22, 1854.

Of Mr. Lincoln's bearing during this trial the Hon. Henry B. Atherton, of Nashua, N. H., who was present and made a record of the matter at the time in his diary, says:

"I had gone to court to hear Brown (Dunlap's chief counsel) simply because he was called a Judge. I never had heard of Lincoln before, but came to the conclusion after hearing him that he was the better speaker of the two, though I believe he was only associate or junior counsel. I should say there was absolutely nothing of the grotesque buffoonery mentioned in the printed article; no long and loud laughs; no removing of coat, vest, and cravat down to 'his one woollen sus pender'; no weeping by jury or spectators, and absolutely no 'Ben. Edwards,' whoever he might have been. I should say that Lincoln tried to belittle the injury done you, and did all he legitimately could to reduce the amount of the verdict. . . . I remember that you had the sympathy of all the best people of Jacksonville, who were not blinded by their political and pro-slavery ideas."

The Hon. I. L. Morrison, a leading attorney of Jacksonville, Ill., now the oldest member of the bar of that city, who was also present at the trial, writes of the article in the REVIEW:

"I think the writer does Mr. Lincoln great injustice in that article. I was at the time of the trial a member of the bar, residing in this city, and was present during the trial. The history of the case, as given by Judge Bergen, did not agree with my recollection, and for that reason I examined the record and files now in the office of the Circuit Court of this County." [Then after giving a history of the proceedings in the suit for damages, Mr. Morrison continues:] "Mr. Lincoln addressed the jury in behalf of his client, and urged the facts in evidence did not call for a verdict assessing vindictive [or punitive damages, contending the facts appearing showed the personal injuries sustained were not serious. The address was not a lengthy one. . . . To represent Mr. Lincoln as trying to influence the jury with something not in the evidence is to place him upon the level of the pettifogger. Excepting Stephen T. Logan, none stood above him in his profession at that time. I would not be understood as contradicting anyone from memory alone, as to what occurred so long ago, but the facts in the case, as supported by the record, strongly tend to show that Judge Bergen's memory is at fault in this respect. Mr. Lincoln made no such exhibition of himself as is represented."

The occasion alluded to in this article was the first on which I had ever seen Mr. Lincoln. Later I became well acquainted with him and was associated with him in the steps which led to the organization of the Republican party in Illinois. The incident referred to never furnished any ground for feeling between us, and from the character and subsequent position of my assailants, as well as his bearing toward me personally, I had abundant reason for believing that he regretted having been brought into the case.

While exercising my right, by the courtesy of the REVIEW, to refute loose and reckless misstatements of fact of an unjust and offensive character as affecting myself, it has been none the less the purpose of this article to vindicate the memory of Abraham Lincoln from statements, put forth in the name of history, picturing him to a succeeding generation, in the years of his mature manhood, in the light of a mountebank and buffoon.

PAUL SELBY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE UNITED STATES OF EUROPE.

Leaning over the parapet at Cannes, looking at the French fleet of men-of-war, some even at that moment leaving for Crete, and catching a glimpse of a great English ironclad bound in the same direction, I fell to musing on this strange development of the eternal European question.

Generous minds have been astonished and irritated in America as well as in Europe by the attitude of their governments toward Crete!

You may turn the matter as you like, this charming (?) harmony of the Powers protects the oppressor at the expense of the oppressed.

The motives for which Europe fought at Navarino needed no explanation! Does any one *dare* say why the Greek fleet before Canea was fired on last year?

The generous minds are right! It would be impossible to acknowledge the real reason of this wonderful harmony in Europe. It cannot be avowed; at least by the diplomats. To an observer it is the most significant event since 1871!

De Beust said at that time: "There is no more Europe!" He was wrong. One "Europe" was ending, but another was born.

For reasons of its own the new Europe wished that France should not seek revenge after 1871. Not only the Cabinets of Europe, but the people were against it; as to-day there is a universal wish that England should remain mistress of Egypt, and also perfect unanimity in protecting the death agony of the Turks from the reclamations of those they oppress. And in this way can be observed on grave questions *an European spirit* each year more marked in its manifestations.

This spirit is not noble, neither is it generous. It inclines to servility before the strong, in spite of solemn oaths, to the crushing of the humble. It is a low spirit, but it exists!

Is this not an historical phenomenon without precedent? If you could take the votes of Europe on the Cretan question, Europe would vote with an enormous majority to crush the Greeks!

The minority in their favor is largely composed of students, artists and thinkers—that is to say, people who have little money. *For the cord that binds the European majority together is of gold*—a cord both very strong and very flexible, which easily crosses frontiers and binds an Englishman, a German, and a Frenchman to the same purpose at the same moment,—when each looks into his morning paper to see what the Turkish debt is selling at!

The political prophets of fifty years ago did not foresee this. They turned over and over the problem of nationalities, trying to group and re-group the nations of the old world. They counted on free education, the emancipation of thought, to form a possible accord among these divers peoples. They whispered to each other, "The United States of Europe," and smiled at their Utopia.

They were not so far from that "United Europe" as they imagined—only it was from causes absolutely opposed to their ideas that this union has been accomplished.

Europe perceives that she has certain general money interests, identical all over the continent, in spite of the differences of language and *régime*, while on matters of local or less general interest Europe is divided against herself.

An English statesman recently affirmed that the majority of the French

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wished the English occupation of Egypt maintained! That is false, as to absolute majority, but it is true as regards the majority *with incomes*—and they alone exert influence (under normal conditions) on the destinies of a country. So the English statesman is on the whole right! For the French are against the Greeks, who have shown themselves bad payers of coupons, and in favor of the Turks, in whose financial regeneration they are deeply interested. The same is true of an Englishman, a Russian, or German, and thus is constituted a sort of international alliance, or rather a new nationality, the nationality of *bond holders*.

The bond holders do not yet raise their flag very proudly. They affect to talk of the "Peace of Europe," "International Rights," and a number of other things that really they care little for, but courage will come when they realize that they are a majority. And they are! The number of people with incomes, and for that reason interested in international matters, is growing every day. Social evolution will not help matters. On the contrary it will quicken the development of the phenomenon, for beneath every Anarchist cry is the money question.

It is useless to say that trade rivalries will exasperate international feeling. The trades will come to some understanding where their money interests are the same.

For example, ask a French seaport to refuse from patriotism to allow a German transatlantic line to take their city as a landing place!

More and more each day financial questions become the same from country to country. When you double the communications between any two points it is (economically) as if you had halved the distance between them. Thus, little by little, the capitals of Europe are drawing nearer each other, the provinces approaching the centers and forming a commercial whole in proportion as their financial exchanges increase.

The "Zollverein" preceded the political union of Germany. As soon as it can be proved that the nations of the world are making among themselves a ruinous financial war, as soon as the taxpayers are weary of paying "bounties" to local industries, you may be sure that the financiers will step forward and arrange among themselves an international understanding. The money centres once working in union, the governments will follow, then the people.

Was it not the "capitalists" of our country that instigated the insurrection in Cuba?

We will see a United States of Europe, united by finance, and many political questions which to-day appear without possible solution (because we insist on arguing on abstract ideas—patriotism, republicanism, "jingoism") will be straightened out by financial necessities, as surely as the mountain snow melted by the sun runs by nature's laws in the streams and rivers to the sea.

This new "union of states" will have all the attributes of our own. Where there is an even greater mixing of peoples, Asia and Europe having each contributed its contingent, they will develop the same financial ferocity and their politics will be a politics of money. Battles will be fought out at the Stock Exchange.

When Cleveland's warlike message made American securities drop on the London markets, how we became suddenly pacific as by enchantment!

The social formula of the future will be bitter protection of money interests and local patriotism replaced by a ferocious individualism.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In this vast "market," what is to become of the artists, the thinkers, those who live by "dreaming," to whom money has no intrinsic value, holding no relation to their work or their fame. The time will be hard for them!

A few enlightened and rich patricians do more for the arts than a universal democracy of people in comfortable circumstances. For with us, in spite of great sums spent with avidity for works of art and a sincere desire to cultivate ourselves on artistic matters, we have remained strangely sterile in art.

The reason is simple enough. In a civilization where everything comes from money and reaches out toward money the most fortunately endowed minds are distorted. The eternally heard "How much is that man worth?" tends to make the artist value himself only by the price his works sell for.

Art banished from the great financial centres will take refuge with some small people protected by their isolation from the great world.

Dreams, all this? Look! The first act of this united Europe was to turn its cannon against a nation culpable of heroism and misery! Against the birthplace of art!

ELIOT GREGORY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED